

The Bible Champion

Volume XXIII.

JULY-AUGUST, 1917

Numbers 7 and 8

From the Pulpit to the Poor-House*

JAY BENSON HAMILTON, D.D.

FOREWORD.

"From the Pulpit to the Poor-house" is a romance from real life. The line between fact and fiction can be drawn with difficulty by the author. It was first used as a sermon in the Trinity Methodist Episcopal Church, Providence, R. I. It was then rewritten and revised and was used as an address at conventions and Annual Conferences. It awakened such deep interest that requests for its publication came from every part of the country. Many ministers solicited permission to use it as an aid in calling the attention of the Church to the needs of the veterans of Methodism. It now goes forth accompanied by other story-sermons of a kindred character. This attempt at preaching by "making believe" is a humble effort to imitate teaching by parable. If the thousands who may read will be as greatly interested as the thousands who have heard, no one will be more gratified than THE EDITOR.

CHAPTER I

A FATHER'S PURPOSE DEFEATED BY A MOTHER'S PRAYER.

"Don't be a fool, John! You can't afford to throw your life away in the Methodist itinerancy. With the start I will give you, you can win success in any business or profession you choose. If you desire to be a farmer, here is the old homestead; it shall be yours. If you want to go to college and fit yourself for a profession, I will gladly help you. But to see you turn your back upon every opportunity for success to become a preacher among the poor and ignorant Methodists is the greatest grief of my life. If you will not listen to me now you will rue it to the end of your life."

"But, father—"

"Just wait until I am through, young man! I am an old fogey, I presume. The boys know more at twenty-five than the fathers do at fifty. You were going to say that to get money is not the worthiest object in life. I have heard you say that more than a hundred times. But you will find money is a handy thing to have around. That will be the first thing you will learn in the Methodist itinerancy. The itinerant is never tempted to get rich. God keeps him humble and the people manage to keep him poor."

"But, father—"

"I am not through yet. If you become a Methodist preacher you will spend your life in hard work and receive a bare support. As soon as you are worn out

you will be cast adrift, like an old horse, to die. Your Church is not magnanimous enough to provide even a poor-house for the pauper ministers. A life of toil, privation, and sacrifice for the pittance of a common laborer! When ineffective because of gray hairs they will turn you adrift with scarce a crust. The pittance they will dole out to you will be as alms to a beggar and will be bestowed with such offensive parade that every instinct of manhood will forbid your accepting it unless you are reduced to absolute penury. If you select a profession with your ability and the training I will secure for you, you will at an early day secure an honorable position, obtain a competence and a home, and even in the decline of life you will receive your largest income. You will find your harvest-time at the very age when in the ministry you will be rejected and without either occupation, home, or means of support. If you decide to become a Methodist preacher you must do it with your eyes wide open. I have done my duty. I have only told you that which you as well as I know to be but the bare truth. What have you to say?"

"Father, I have decided to become a Methodist preacher if I have to die in the poor-house."

This brief dialogue occurred many years ago in a New England farmhouse.* The father had little interest in or sympathy with religious people. In spite of his Methodist wife he claimed to have a positive dislike for, and bitter prejudice against, the Methodists. He was very proud of his bright, active boy, and was greatly vexed when the young man was converted and became a Methodist. When the father remonstrated, and threatened the son, he proved to be a chip of the old block. The father said one day:

"I have a great mind to turn you out of doors if you do not stay away from those pesky Methodists!"

The son quietly replied:

"Father, I have always honored and respected you; but in this matter I claim the right to decide for myself. You have always urged me to have a mind and an opinion of my own. I have tried to obey you in other things and I demand the right to do so in my religion. I am a Methodist not from impulse, but from principle and conviction. If you bid me leave your house I will sorrowfully obey you; but I cannot cease to be a Methodist."

The father was at first bitterly enraged, and then sorely grieved, when he learned that his son proposed to become a Methodist preacher. He tried every expedient to avert what he firmly believed would be a disaster. The morning that the young man was to start to the Annual Conference to be received on trial, the conversation took place which I have related at the opening of my story. When the father found all his arguments and entreaties of no avail he gave the young man the best horse in his barn, with bridle, saddle, and saddle-bags. He said, with a grim smile, as he noticed the surprise created by the very appropriate gift:

*When I read this story in New England I always located it out West. It saved trouble.

"I had reason to believe that you inherited enough of the family stubbornness not to heed your father's counsel. I have all along felt sure that you would persist in making a fool of yourself in spite of all my remonstrance and advice. I am not sure but I am largely responsible for your folly. 'Forbid a fool a thing and that he'll do.' If I had only remembered that 'fools are not to be convinced,' and had humored your fancy instead of opposing it, I might have saved myself the humiliation and you the misfortune of the blunder of this hour. If you will not listen to reason, but are determined to become a traveling beggar, my family pride compels me to give you a respectable outfit."

The young man, with tearful eyes, grasped his father's hard hand with a fervent grip and said:

"Father, I deeply regret that duty compels me to cause you so great a disappointment. I thank you for your generous gift." And then with a smile through his tears, he said:

"I will try to prove false the old adage you have uttered so often: 'Put a beggar on horse-back and he'll ride to the devil!'"

Mother and son had a tender parting upon which we will not intrude. The young man mounted his horse with wet eyes. That scene in his mother's chamber he would never forget. He had received his mother's farewell kiss and blessing. Her farewell words encouraged him as he thought about them all the way to the Conference. She had said, with eyes shining through her tears:

"My son, I have prayed that you might become a Methodist minister ever since the day you were born. May God make you a successful one, is your mother's only wish and prayer."

CHAPTER II.

A BITTER-SWEET HONEY-MOON.

It will be impossible in this brief space to follow the steps of the young itinerant through his whole ministerial life. Our purpose will be accomplished by recording its closing chapters. His experience was in no particular different from that of most of his brethren. He began with the smallest and hardest places. His work was fairly successful, but required the sacrifice and heroism so common to all itinerants as never to receive mention. His life passed uneventfully along year by year; he rarely suffered from want; he never enjoyed the luxuries of life; he was always poor. A brief glance at one of the many appointments he served may account for the smallness of his savings. The trip from the seat of Conference to one of his charges was his marriage tour. The minister and his new wife, whose honey-moon began with the Conference session, had talked in a confidential way about the happiness of love in a cottage parsonage. They had tried to guess the shape and color of the house, the number of the rooms, and the pattern of the carpets and the kind of furniture until they had become so interested that each chided the other with preparing the way for a great disappointment.

They were met at the depot by a committee of a half-dozen of the leading

members of the church. After the greeting was given, one after another began to say how happy they would be to have their new pastor and his wife stop with them; but one "had such a small house;" another "had a sick wife;" another "had so many children." The minister said:

"Have you a hotel here?"

"Yes," said one of the committee, who had not spoken; "I keep the hotel!"

"Please take our checks and have our baggage taken to the hotel. We will stop with you until we can make other arrangements."

This proposition was so quickly assented to by all as "just the thing," that the pastor and his wife said to each other, at the first moment of privacy, "That must have been arranged beforehand."

One week's boarding at regular hotel rates convinced the minister that the small salary he was likely to receive would all be exhausted before the first quarterly meeting. "The parsonage is a little out of repair," the hotel-keeper said, a little testily, when he found he was to lose his boarders. He had insisted that, as business was business, the pastor should pay full price and weekly in advance. When the minister ventured to ask if the parsonage could not be sufficiently repaired to make it habitable the reply was still more curt:

"The church is too poor to repair it. There is no furniture, and the Ladies' Aid Society is too small and weak to buy any."

The minister and his wife visited the parsonage. It had not been opened for nearly a year. The former minister had been a single man, and the church had been unable to rent the house by reason of its dilapidated condition. It was a little cottage one story and a half high. The red paint with which it had been painted many years before had peeled off in many places and had faded in others, so that the question as to color was decided a draw. The wife suggested that "mottle" was the nearest color. It was situated upon a narrow back street. The gate was off the hinges; most of the fence was torn down; the yard had been the village resort for boys and wandering animals, until it was a sorry and desolate looking spot. The window sashes evidenced that the boys emulated the Benjamite accomplishment of slinging stones "at a hair-breadth without a miss." The porch swayed and creaked when the minister stepped upon it. After unlocking the door it required two men to force it open. The ceilings were low, black, and damp-looking; the walls had been papered, but much of the paper had fallen off; the floor was sunken and wet. The cellar was half full of water. The air felt damp and chill. Every thing was cheerless enough, but the wife said, with a bright smile through her tears:

"We have love and the cottage, you know."

The hotel-keeper, who had looked the house over with illy concealed disgust and contempt, said:

"I would not stable my horses in such a hole. If you prefer to go to house-keeping here, rather than board with me, you may. But you may be sure the church has no money to throw away fixing it up or furnishing it."

The pastor quietly replied:

"I have estimated the expense of boarding with you at the rate with which we have begun, and I find that the salary which has been estimated will pay our board with you just six months and leave us not a penny for clothes. I agree with you that this shanty is not fit for a decent stable; but as it is the best our people seem to care to do for a house for us we must make the best of it."

After a week's hard work painting, scrubbing, and papering, the old house began to look cosy and neat. Most of the wife's savings from her salary as a school-teacher were expended in very scantily furnishing two or three of the rooms. The first night they occupied their new home it rained. They were awakened by the dash of the rain upon the window and roof. The wife said:

"My dear, what a comfort it is to have a roof over our heads such a night as this."

Just at that moment a large drop of water fell in her face, followed in quick succession by a dozen small ones. The roof had sprung a leak. The water collecting overhead began to ooze through the plastering. She did not finish her remark. They moved the bed to another part of the room, but had scarcely lain down before a large drop fell in the minister's face. They moved the bed five times, and placed it under a leak every time. The minister tried to light a match, but the matches had been under a leak, too. After a long and blundering search in the dark the minister found the umbrella, which he hoisted over their heads, saying:

"What a comfort it is, my dear, to have a roof over our heads such a night as this."

The night ended, as all nights must, but seemed in no hurry about it. The minister said, as daylight began to appear:

"Thank heaven, it's over at last."

He sprang back into bed with a cry of surprise and dismay. The water in the room was about ankle deep. The water from the hill back of the house, added to what came in through the roof, made a respectable sized pond for a family of two. The fire was out, the matches were wet, their clothes were thoroughly saturated with water, and the minister's boots were half full of water.

The parsonage was a fair illustration of the church. One incident of many of a similar character may give a faint idea of the broad-minded and liberal spirit of the officary of the church.

One of the stewards brought in a fine turkey and pumpkin pie as his usual Thanksgiving present to his pastor. The present was thankfully received. The minister, surprised out of his usual self-possession by the novelty of receiving a present of real value, said:

"This is such a large and fine bird it is, a pity we have but two in our family; suppose you come and help eat it."

To the utter dismay of the minister and his wife, the good brother instantly accepted the invitation, and said:

"I will bring my wife and all the family, so you won't be so lonesome."

When he had gone, the minister, seeing the look of sorrowful perplexity upon his wife's face, said:

"My dear, I was only joking; I had no idea he would accept."

She deliberately went to the book-case, and taking down the Discipline turned to rule second for a preacher's conduct, and read aloud: "'Be serious, avoid all lightness, jesting, and foolish talking.' My dear, please never joke again with that brother."

When Thanksgiving came the steward and stewardess and seven young stewards came. They ate as if they had fasted a week in anticipation of such a feast. When the next quarterly meeting came round the minister was handed by the church treasurer a bill for three dollars for the turkey. It was credited as one year's quarterage of the steward and charged as cash upon the pastor's salary.

"Let me see," said the minister; "how much did that turkey weigh?"

"Fifteen pounds."

"What is turkey worth a pound?"

"Fifteen cents."

"Then the turkey was worth two dollars and twenty-five cents. That makes the pumpkin pie cost me seventy-five cents. The turkey is all right, but pumpkin pies are too great luxuries and a little too expensive for a family as large as ours at Thanksgiving."

BIBLE CHAMPION CLUB RATE

WITH

THE BIBLIOTHECA SACRA.

The Bibliotheca Sacra is to be congratulated upon its long and brilliant career. It has no superior in the character of the subjects treated, and for the intellectual ability and literary rank of its contributors. The editor, G. Frederick Wright, LL.D., alone, is enough to make the Quarterly one of the foremost leaders of the world in the realm which has commanded the interest and labor of his whole life.

"I have taken *The Bibliotheca Sacra* since a student at the Seminary in 1870 at Gettysburg. I have found nothing to surpass it; safe, sound scholarship and wholesome counsel; never erratic or speculative; or in the bad sense, critical."—*Reader of THE BIBLE CHAMPION.*

All new subscribers to *The Bibliotheca Sacra* may secure both magazines for one year for \$3.00. This should be paid in advance and sent to THE BIBLE CHAMPION.

A GOOD BOOK FOR BIBLE SCHOOLS.

. . . . GLEIG'S WONDERFUL BOOK CONCERNING THE MOST WONDERFUL BOOK IN THE WORLD. Introduction by the Rev. Sylvanus Stall, D.D. This book was written nearly one hundred years ago. It should never have been out of print. The author believed the Bible either to be all true or not true at all. It is not a commentary or a critical study or analysis of the Bible, but it presents a most charming and impressive narrative, comprehending and including all the books from Genesis to Revelation. It unifies and centralizes the sixty-six books into one, giving that unity and comprehensiveness of view which the Bible student needs in order to make effective his reading and study of the Bible itself. Sunday-school teachers, and especially Bible class teachers, will find it of especial value. \$1.80 net.

THE ARENA

The Two Genealogies

H. W. MAGOUN, PH.D.

Attention was called, in the February number, to an omission in the series on the Virgin Birth, which began in October, 1914. It was published in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, and had reference to the apparently conflicting genealogies. As was stated, it was somewhat technical. More than that, it was not entirely satisfactory, because it did not go to the bottom of the question. There was some elusive element that was not detected. It never had been detected. At last, however, the real situation has been uncovered by a very simple process. It will be explained in the present article.

Luke's preliminary list need occasion no trouble. He wanted his work to be complete. From Abraham to David he is in substantial agreement with Matthew, although he omits all reference to the women mentioned by Matthew. He had to do this, as will appear later. The divergencies begin after David is reached. Between him and Jesus the two lines appear to be practically distinct except for the names of Shealtiel and Zerubbabel, which are found in both lists near the middle. Possible identifications in the case of a few other names have been made, the most prominent being Matthew's Joram for Jorim, Abiud for Joda, and Matthan for Matthat, in Luke's list.

Various attempts have been made to get rid of the difficulty. The lists have been called imaginary. Levirate marriage has been resorted to as an explanation. Two possible solutions have survived. One goes back to the days of Grotius (1583-1645), who taught that Matthew gave the legal line of Joseph as a successor to the throne of David, Luke confining his attention to the private line. The other is more recent. It teaches that Luke's list contains Mary's line, while Matthew's contains that of Joseph.

This solution has had a wide acceptance. It is based on two considerations. In the second century Celsus derided the notion

that "through so lowly a woman as the carpenter's wife, Jesus should trace his lineage up to the first man," a statement which seems to have been taken seriously by Origen, who proceeded to answer him on the same basis. It has been inferred that the two genealogies were not the same, but that one was Mary's and the other Joseph's. That inference is undoubtedly correct. It was then inferred that Luke's must be Mary's, and an elaborate argument was constructed to show this. The basis employed was the fact that Luke omitted the article with Joseph but used it in connection with all the other proper names that followed. This was simply a downright blunder, and as such it must be recognized.

The blunder is old, as is shown by the italics in the Authorized Version. It has disappeared in the Revisions. That is well, since it flatly contradicts Greek usage and ought never to have been made. If the article is used with a proper name in Greek, it is always significant. It harks back to its original demonstrative character and means *the*, the well-known (our), the one and only, the aforesaid, etc. Now, none of these meanings can possibly be found in the usage followed by Luke, who does what any other Gentile would have done and employs the article instead of repeating the word "son." The whole thing is as simple as it can be.

Similarly, in ii. 49, Luke has "in the of the Father of me," for in the house of my Father, and the idiom is thoroughly Greek. In Mark (ii. 14) we find "Levi the of the Alphaeus," meaning Levi son of our Alphaeus, and Matthew duplicates the same curious usage at x. 2 and 3. Luke omits the article very properly in iv. 22, "son of Joseph," in xix. 9, "son of Abraham," and in xx. 41, "son of David." In each instance, moreover, the actual meaning involved in the expression amounts to the same as that of a modern surname.

The same thing is true of such combinations as sons of Zebedee (Mt. xxvi. 37, Mk. x. 35, Lu. v. 10) and son of David (Mt. xxi. 9, 15). This is made plain by the Scriptures themselves. Thus, *Simōn Bariōnā* appears in the Greek in Mt. xvi. 17, while *Simōn Iōanou* is found in Jo. xxi. 16, each being an exact equivalent for the other. Both mean Simon John-son. Moreover, the second term in each of the forms exactly parallels *huie Daueid* (Mt. ix. 27, etc.), which is the Greek for "son of David." It really means, then, David-son. Jesus was a David-son. That is what he had to be to be the Messiah.

Cases in which the article is used may now be mentioned. They are:—Jesus, son of our Joseph, the one from Nazareth" (Jo. i. 45), "thou art king of our Israel" (Jo. i. 49), "that Judas, son-of-Simon Iscariot" (Jo. vi. 71), "that-man Saul, son of Cis" (Acts xiii. 21), "Of our David" (Mt. xxii. 42), and "the son of that Mary" (Mk. vi. 3). In each and every instance the article has its original demonstrative force and, with one exception, definitely points out a certain individual who is more or less conspicuous.

Wherever the Greek has "son of" or "the son of" or "the of" or simply "of," the corresponding Aramaic expression is the prefix Bar-, the Hebrew one being Ben-. When Mark says "the son of Timaeus, Bartimaeus" (x. 46), he is using both the Greek and the Hebrew idioms, one expression being an equivalent for the other. Similar names are Barsabas, Bartholomew, Barabbas, etc., and, in Hebrew, Ben-hadad (1 Ki. xv. 18; 2 Chron. xvi. 2; etc.), Ben-ammi (Gen. xix. 38), and (R. V.) Ben-abinidab, Ben-deker, Bengeber, Ben-hesed, and Ben-hur (1 Ki. iv. 8-13), which settle the idiom. Benjamin is similarly formed.

It is therefore clear that Luke has used *hōs enomizeto* in its proper idiomatic sense, and that it does not mean "as was supposed. What it ought to mean is this,— "as the custom was." To the translators that meaning made no sense. They accordingly did the best they could with it and rendered as we now have it. They did not understand Luke, who is brief but

thoroughly consistent in what he says. It amounts to this. Jesus was enrolled, in spite of the fact that he was not the son of Joseph, in accordance with the regular legal custom, as if he were his son, his name being Jesus Joseph-son. In this no article could be used, since it merely furnished his legal name.

An article in such a place is not only unnecessary but also misleading, since it might be assumed that Jesus actually was the son of Joseph if the formal expression, "the son of," was employed. As already shown, no article was pertinent with any of the proper names. Each article therefore stands for an omitted "son," and each is in apposition with the preceding proper name. Luke says "the of" instead of "son of," and thus differentiates Jesus from all the rest in a perfectly simple way. The whole is a masterpiece of brevity, lucidity, and thoroughness. Jesus' name is Jesus Joseph-son. His foster father's name is Joseph Heli-son. His grandfather's name is Heli Matthan-son. Similarly, Seth's name is Seth Adam-son. Each can be seen on the instant, and there is no possible chance for any confusion.

Luke's list, then, is Joseph's genealogy, and there is no ground for the slightest question of that reality. Luke was a Gentile out after facts. He got them. He spoke and wrote as a Greek. He was a physician and cared nothing for Hebrew royal lines. Matthew, on the other hand, cared everything for the royal line, and that fact is itself pregnant with significance. Jesus must be in that royal line or—he was not the Messiah. But in every country it is a matter of custom to take the nearest of kin when the royal line fails. That, therefore, must be a contingency in Matthew's list.

His use of "beget" must accordingly be examined. He says (i. 8) that Joram beget Uziah (Azariah), omitting Ahaziah, Joash, and Amaziah, as appears from 1 Chron. iii. 11-12. He thus makes a man "beget" his great great grandson. Next, in verse 11, he makes Josiah beget Jecho-niah and omits Jehoia-kim. Then, in verse 12, he has Shealtiel beget Zerubbabel, although the latter is the son of his younger

brother Pedaiah, as appears from 1 Chron. iii. 19. This man, then, has begotten his nephew. How many more like these there are we have no means of knowing; but it at once becomes clear that if either genealogy is not to be taken at its face value it is Matthew's. His use of 'begat' must accordingly be idiomatic, embodying a legal fiction.

On the face of things, Matthew's list is the line of Joseph. That cannot be denied. On the basis now laid down, however, his list may easily be the line of Mary; for his actual object is to show that Jesus is the rightful heir to the throne of David, and, with that, Joseph may have nothing whatever to do. He is, in fact, ruled out, because he was not the father of Jesus. Mary was in the royal line. Tradition settles that point. She was therefore the daughter of Jacob, of whom Matthew says, "Jacob begat Joseph the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus," etc. Why Mary should be mentioned has always been a puzzle. It is simple enough. She was the important one but could not count, and it was necessary to put Joseph forward in her place to represent her. In doing so, Matthew treated him exactly as he did Zerubabel.

Jacob "begat" Joseph, then, through his younger brother Heli, precisely as Shealtiel "begat" Zerubbabel through his younger brother Pedaiah. That is all there is to that, and we can now guess why Matthew brought in other women in his list to keep Mary in countenance. Tamar had been a bit irregular (Gen. xxxviii. 12-30), Ruth might be called in question (Ruth iii. 6-18), and the wife of Uriah had had her difficulty (2 Sam. xi. 2-5). One other woman is also mentioned, Rahab, in verse 5. Taking the whole together, it appears that Matthew had no doubt as to her identity, whatever modern scholars may now think about the matter. He evidently regarded her as the Rahab saved at Jerico (Josh. vi. 25), and Josephus (*Ant.* V. i. 2, 7) supports that view by his spelling of the name, even if Heb. xi. 31 and Jas. ii. 25 do have *Rhaab* without the *ch*. It is chiefly a question of transliteration, and different

authors may easily vary in their usage, as English Rahab goes to show.

There are four other women to be reckoned with, then, in case any one calls Mary in question, all in the royal line and all accepted without hesitation. Each of them has a weak spot similar to Mary's, if she has to face any possibility of that kind. Joseph, moreover, is sponsor for her, since he is her husband. Her issue, then, is properly in the royal line, and if Jacob died without a male heir Joseph would be reckoned as a *begotten* son of his without further action of any sort. Jacob could also make him his heir, if he so willed, and he may have done so. Meanwhile Mary would count as a Heli-son, taking her husband's name, and she would be so spoken of. There is evidence that she was so spoken of among the Jews. It was the only natural thing to do, as must be clear.

Mary and Joseph were cousins. Their fathers must therefore have been brothers, as already indicated, and they must have had the same grandfather. To indentify Matthat with Matthan, we have only to remember that the official language of the Roman Empire, inherited from Alexander the Great, was Greek, the so-called *koinē*. Genealogies, being matters of public record, would have to be written with Greek letters, and a poor Nū might easily pass for a Tau, as I learned to my astonishment by discovering such a letter in my own notes in a "Harmony of the Gospels." Luke, then, read a Nū as a Tau and so made the error. It was a simple thing to do.

It appears, therefore, that Luke does give the natural line, as has been inferred, and Matthew the legal one; but it also appears that *Luke meant to give Joseph's line, while Matthew purposely gave Mary's*. This consideration makes the fling of Celsus clear. Mary was merely the wife of a carpenter. She was therefore of no account, no matter what her claims to royalty might be. It was a case of special pleading for a definite purpose.

But there is more yet to be considered. Eliakim was cursed (Jer. xxxvi. 30), and no issue of his was to sit on the throne of David. His son, Coniah or Jeconiah, did

reign after a fashion for three months; but he too was cursed (Jer. xxii. 30) and was to be written childless. The son that he "begat" (Mt. i. 12) was therefore probably his grandson, the child of his daughter—women did not count—and her husband Neri, who appears in Luke's list as the father of Shealtiel. That divergence may therefore be accounted for. The curse was fulfilled, and the line passed from Coniah to a descendant of Nathan. It was still the royal line, however, because Shealtiel became the heir of Coniah. He was accordingly reckoned as his *begotten* son.

As Neri did not properly come into the line except as a figurehead, his wife being the actual potent factor in the descent, Matthew would omit him. He must have omitted various others; for Luke has six more names than he has between David and Shealtiel, and nine more between Shealtiel and Jesus. Such omissions are too common to cause any trouble, and they amount to little more than the omission of a man's middle or first name or names, where he has several. Thus Felix Mendelssohn is really Jakob Ludwig Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy, and the double surname illustrates beautifully the idiom used in the New Testament. The first part translates the prefix Bar-, while the second part retains it. The entire name is Jewish, not properly German, and that, too, is significant.

It happens that the Greek had lost its patronymics and had come to use the word *huios*—with or without the article,—or the article itself, or merely the genitive case, in place of its patronymic substitute for our modern surnames. It is therefore a much better translation than the English, even if the form appears to be the same in the two languages. The content of the words is not the same, and content is always the thing that counts. Greek *huios* retains the color of the prefix Bar-, while English "son of" does not. The suffix -son is therefore needed in this connection to indicate the patronymic form of the second name. The history of such matters is a curious one.

The use of a patronymic—Hebrew names

beginning with Bar- or Ben- are of that type—for a second or distinguishing name is exceedingly old. It still survives in the back districts of Scandinavia, though discarded in the cities. If John has a son Peter, his name is Peter Johnson. Peter's son William then becomes William Peterson. William's son James is, in turn, James Williamson, and so it goes down through the ages. It is the simple and natural method of identifying men, and it seems to have been resorted to by many nations and peoples. When it began no one knows.

After a time other names came to be used, having reference to personal characteristics or occupation, etc., such as William Rufus (the red), John Smith (the smith), Peter Turner (the turner), James Wheelwright (the wheelwright), etc. About the middle of the eleventh century such names began to be used as family or surnames; but it was not until after the thirteenth that the practice became fixed. The patronymics were then included, becoming surnames like the rest. How common these were can be guessed from the following list obtained in a short time from "Who's Who in America":—Adamson, Addison, Anderson, Bronson, Clarkson, Davidson, Davison, Denson, Dodson, Edison, Edson, Elson, Emerson, Ferguson, Fergusson, Gibson, Grayson, Gunnison, Hanson, Henderson, Hendrickson, Hendrixson, Hobson, Hopkinson, Hudson, Hutchinson, Hutchison, Iverson, Jackson, Jameson, Jamieson, Jamison, Jefferson, Jemison, Johnson, Josephson, Judson, Kempson, Lamson, Larson, Manson, Marcasson, Masterson, Mathewson, Mathison, Matteson, Matson, Matthison, Mattison, Mattson, Munson, Neilson, Nelson, Nicholson, Nicolson, Olson, Olsson, Parkinson, Patterson, Patteson, Pattison, Pearson, Peterson, Pirsson, Rawson, Richardson, Richeson, Ricketson, Robertson, Robinson, Robson, Sampson, Samson, Sanderson, Sandison, Shepardson, Simpson, Sisson, Smithson, Stephenson, Stetson, Stevenson, Stimson, Swanson, Thompson, Thomson, Thorkelson, Tomlinson, Vinson, Watson, Watterson, Whitson, Wilkinson, Williamson, Willson, Wilson, and Wixson.

Not counting variations, here are over seventy-five such names, and there are others like them ending in -sohn and -sen. Still to be reckoned with are the prefixes Mc, M', Fitz- (Norman), O' (Irish), and Ap- (Welsh), all of which are equivalents of Aramaic Bar-, to say nothing of the fact that -s in an English name (as in Simons) may mean "son of" and thus lengthen the list. The extent of this usage has never been realized, because there has been no occasion to consider the matter in detail. English is full of its fossil remains, however, and they must be allowed to testify in the search after the truth. They rob Jesus Joseph-son of all strangeness and make it merely natural. He was named in the legal way, using the ancient idiom.

We have lost track of this idiom and scholars have not recognized it in the New Testament, or in the Old for that matter,

and so we have failed to get all the meaning of Luke in this connection. It is really very simple after all; for he gives the enrollment of the boy Jesus, as it appeared in the civil lists, without regard to other matters, while Matthew punctiliously follows the royal line up to and including Mary, with all its fluctuations tacitly implied if not fully expressed. Here, then, at last, we have a definite and tenable explanation of the facts as they now appear in the Scriptures. Luke followed the natural bent of a Gentile physician and gave Joseph's pedigree and Jesus's full legal name in that connection, while Matthew painstakingly showed to the Jews that Jesus was in the royal line as the son of Mary and therefore the expected Messiah. Both genealogies are accordingly needed, if we are to have a complete picture of the situation as it really was.

Disagreements Among Evolutionists.

PROF. L. T. TOWNSEND, LL.D.

One has not to read many books that treat on evolution before making the discovery that advocates of the theory hold opinions so antagonistic to one another that the theory on that very account might well be questioned. At all events it is generally acknowledged that it is a bad showing for any theory when its followers are in disagreement among themselves.

The distinction between atheistic and theistic evolution, both of which have its defenders, already has been pointed out and need not therefore long detain us.

It is the opinion of Professor Haeckel that the majority of scientists are theistic evolutionists. He says, "Most naturalists of the present day are inclined to give up the attempt at natural explanation and take refuge in the miracle of an inconceivable creation."

There is, however, a fairly strong minority who are still inclined to follow the leadership of the Professor to the extent, at least, of being glad if they can find in matter all that is essential in the building of the world and filling it with living

creatures, and who also, as M. de Cyon says "wish to be delivered from religion and the restraints imposed by the moral law on covetousness and human passion," and who we may add are on a constant lookout for ways and means of doing away entirely with supernatural interpositions.

The makeshifts resorted to by those who are seeking scientific and theological reconciliations are little else than confusing and often ridiculous.

There are those who appearing to be unable to rid the mind of theistic notions admit into their scheme a something that very much resembles, except in name a personal God. Says David F. Strauss in *Old Faith and New*, "We demand the same piety for our cosmos that the devout of old demanded for their God."

Dr. Lycock has a fancy that matter is possessed of "an unconscious intelligence," and Professor Bain says that matter is, "a double-faced somewhat having a spiritual and physical side."

In passing we may suggest that these

schemes of Strauss, Lycock, Bain and others are a very poor substitute for a pronounced atheistic evolution, and of course are no substitute at all for theistic evolution. They show that the evidence of an intelligent determining agency in the universe is so constant and forceful that the human mind quite resolutely refuses to let the supernatural have a complete go-by.

Other evolutionists are devout believers in an infinite Creator. Professors Dana, Gray, Mivart, and many others though so far overcome by the spirit of their day that they accepted evolutionary views in a general way, insisting, however, that natural selection could not be effective except in harmony with the designs of the Creator. They felt that there could be no selection unless there were an intelligent Selector, and no creation without an intelligent Creator.

It is, therefore, sufficient to say, so far as the theology of evolution is concerned, that these differences of opinion among evolutionists are never likely to reach reconciliation. It is one or the other—a Creator having intelligence and power, or Professor Haeckel's Monism which means one thing only in the universe, that is, matter with next to infinite endowments and possibilities.

The extent to which the theory of evolution may or may not be applied to other subjects as well as to geology and biology, has likewise been under discussion, and if the theory is true its application may of course be far reaching, and philosophers and higher critics are authorized to reconstruct history, theology, the records of the Bible and other branches of learning so they will harmonize with the teachings of organic evolution. But to do this, as was done by Herbert Spencer when he applied the theory to social economy and government, or when Professor Drummond followed this same hypothesis in the writing of his two books that were very popular for a time, is hazardous before the theory had secured good standing.

Goldwin Smith thought he was building on a sure foundation when in arguing for

the Immortality of the Soul he took for his text this unproved statement:

"It has been overwhelmingly demonstrated that man's bodily frame, and its soul, as its outcome and perfection, have been produced by a process of evolution from lower forms of animal life, may be of vegetable life."

And Dr. Clifford thought the same thing when building his destructive criticism on these words:

"We have in the main accepted evolution, and thereby can the better understand the majestic ways of God."

This however should be said, that while a few writers are defending and using this wide application of evolution it is far less persistent today than it was a few years ago.

Dr. Clifford Russel in his essay on "Evolution and Character" thus threw his influence against this enlarged scope of evolution:

"Evolution is supposed by many to indicate a great scientific theory which is applicable to and explains all the phenomena of the universe. But this is very largely an erroneous view. It has so far only given us a fairly complete explanation in certain departments of nature, and even in these it never carries us back to the beginning of things, while over some of the broadest fields of scientific research it has been almost entirely inoperative."

Dr. Dewar's statement, when speaking of this erroneous use of the theory, is this: "The application of the evolutionary theory to knowledge in general is proceeding very recklessly."

It would seem, therefore, that before this day we ought to have heard the last of any controversy as to the application of the theory of evolution outside of biology and geology and that it never again will be employed in efforts to reconstruct ancient history, the records of the Bible or be used in the defence or illustration of any other kindred subject that may be under investigation.

Evolutionists as would be expected are also of divided ranks as to man's origin and development. Monistic evolutionists,

represented by Professor Haeckel, contend that man, body and soul must have been evolved from one and the same substance. On the other hand Dr. Alfred Russell Wallace, while not strongly opposing the theory that man's body may have been developed from lower animals yet strongly insists that there is no possibility of such an origin for his intellectual and moral faculties. "These faculties" he says "could not have been so developed, but must have had another origin; and for this origin we can only find an adequate cause in the unseen universe of spirit."

Again, evolutionists, followers of Lamarck insist that characteristics or variations acquired by parents during their lifetime are transmitted to their offspring. But others represented by L. Plate contend that such acquired variations have no valid scientific evidence in their support.

August Weismann, while defending evolution ignored every scheme except adaptation. William Bateson on the other hand regarded the study of adaptation as altogether profitless.

Jaekel, Kolliskee, Kosschinsky, de Vries, Duke of Argyll, Mivart and H. F. Osborn have entered a defence for the mutation theory, but some recent scientists, Chemerian and J. A. Allen, said to be "deans in the study of birds and mammals," and several others are pronounced antagonists of the mutation theory.

The question whether intrinsic or extrinsic forces play the more important part in development also has afforded ground for controversy. Evolutionists represented by Nägeli have contended that there is "an inner directive force in living things" and that plants and animals would have developed about the same whether or not environments, such as geologic conditions, climate and nutrition had been different. The more specific statements are that "evolution has been continually controlled by unknown forces inherent in organisms";

that there is "an internal principle of improvement entirely independent of the outside world that stretches toward some ideal goal."

George B. Foster puts the matter thus: "Evolution is not explicable mechanically. The origin of higher forms from lower is possible only on account of a tendency to progress which resides in the organism."

Professor Le Conte's definition of evolution points in the same direction: "It is a continuous, progressive change by means of resident forces." Professor E. D. Coke carried the thought a step further and in his earlier teaching of evolution introduced a something he called "protoplasmic consciousness," "a determining consciousness," and "a conscious state that precedes the evolution of animal forms."

If, therefore, a Creator is excluded, then according to these statements matter must be endowed with both consciousness and infinite wisdom, which laymen feel is a bold-faced absurdity.

While thus the theory of innate provisions for development has had the support of these and other biologists of high standing, yet the evidence against it, especially in case of chemical action on plastic organisms and in case of regressive strictures, has been so convincing that many evolutionists have been led to oppose out and out this theory of resident forces.

August Weismann is an acknowledged representative of this last view and has had no small following. In his book, *Studies Concerning the Theory of Descent*, he combats the theory of an "internal principle" as an important agency in evolution and argues that "in all development in the past of whatever character there has been some force external to nature that has come into contact with the course of things and has given them a new and progressive tendency."

William L. Tower in a recent paper on the "Evolution of Beetles" thus supports the views of Weismann:

"In the explanation of the origin of variation in organisms the only assumption we need make is that the original unit of organic matter was possessed of all attributes

necessary for development from external stimuli and is not due to inherent tendencies or latencies, or the product of mystic elements."

George Paulin, author of *No Struggle for Existence; No Natural Selection*, also follows the lead of Weismann: "Organic beings," he says, "are mere passive recipients of the modifying forces of nature, without possessing in themselves the slightest power of choosing."

As would be expected, other scientists contend that there are both external and internal forces at work in the direction and growth of living things. This seems reasonable. But we are not so much interested in the settlement of the question of biological or chemical forces as we are in showing the controversies that have been going on among disputants respecting these forces.

What may be termed the geology and paleontology of evolution call for a passing notice.

James Hutton (1726-1797) published a book entitled *Theory of the Earth*. He was the forerunner of what is termed uniformitarianism, sometimes called the quietistic theory. Another word may be substituted that answers the purpose as well and is shorter, which is, uniformity. Hutton held sway over scientists for a few years and then gave way to George Cuvier (1769-1832), who advocated what was termed catastrophism or cataclysm, meaning a violent and extreme overthrow of the ordinary phenomena of nature. During a half century Cuvier's word was law in the scientific world. But for some reason, one hardly knows why, scientists seemed to tire of Cuvier, and then Lyell (1797-1875) with his uniformity theory held the scientific world in a sort of trance. The ground was thus prepared and Mr. Darwin placed biology side by side with Lyell's geology. The public mind, being made ready for Mr. Darwin's theory, bowed to his teachings in numbers that always will be regarded with surprise.

In the '60's and '70's there were but few scientists and philosophers who opposed the

views of Darwin and Lyell that "nature makes no leaps" and "knows no gaps," and that all her processes "are continuous and slow," and that "all changes must be barely discernible."

But in the nineties opposition to uniformity began to show itself. Leading geologists could not reconcile that theory with the great and sudden physical changes that were known to have taken place during the earth's history. Biologists were likewise in trouble, being confronted here and there with sports as they were called, that is, with species which appear suddenly and without special reference to the animal tribe to which they belong; there seemed no possible way of reconciling these new arrivals with the uniformity hypothesis. A return to the cataclysmic theory of Cuvier was therefore inevitable, and the downfall of Lyell and Darwin of necessity followed. This change of the popular mind was much helped by Professor Hugo de Vries of Amsterdam in his book, *The Mutation Theory*; it was made clear as he claimed that "the species arise from one another not by slow processes but by leaps and bounds." "The new species appear all at once" . . . "and independent of those from which they sprang." This opinion was also strongly supported by Sir Francis Galton in his book entitled *Discontinuity of Evolution*, also by a similar work published by William Bateson.

The conflict between these two opposing views resulted for a time in no inconsiderable contentious, if not bad feeling.

The age of the earth in its present form and the beginning of botanical and biological life on earth are subjects that have called forth any amount of discussion.

Mr. Darwin's theory as originally propounded called for the existence of the earth in substantially its present condition for an exceedingly long time, not to say an infinite duration. In the first edition of *Origin of Species* he arrived at the amazing conclusion that 306,662,400 years was a mere trifle in geological time.

His son, George H. Darwin, held the opinion that life on earth is limited to a

hundred million years and perhaps to fifty million. Lord Kelvin reduced the time to thirty million. But Professor Romanes, in his book *Darwin and After Darwin*, in the following quotation appears to favor the opinion advocated by a score of other leading scientists that "there cannot have been any such enormous reaches of unrecorded time as would be implied by the supposition of there having been a lost history of organic evolution before the time man appears on the earth." And some of the more recent geologists insist that nothing definitely reliable as to durations can be gathered from geological investigations, and that all theories as to the time of life on earth are mere speculations.

It is not surprising, therefore, that Professor Huxley at one time had no confidence in fossils either in support of evolution or as a means of measuring geological periods, but later placed a high value upon fossils, and then later still yielded geological evidence in favor of that derived from biology. The facts that the so-called older deposits are sometimes found above the so-called newer ones, that the intermediate formations are found skipping in and out of place regardless of a geological history which in the past has had respectable standing, force a measure of uncertainty into all calculations.

It may be safely said that differences in scientific calculations as to geological and biological periods are so diverse and uncertain that if we should say that the development of life on earth is limited by thousands, rather than by millions of years, and if we should say that no being who is at all man-like has been on earth longer than twenty thousand years at the outside, no scientist at the present time is capable of disproving either of these statements.*

*For a recent statement of this subject consult *Illogical Geology* by Professor George McCready Price.

We may add to this note that radio active elements are in the way of still further upsetting geological time estimates. This new science has led to the conclusion that the oldest igneous rocks on the earth's surface may not date back beyond fifteen thousand years.

Conflicting opinions among evolutionists as to what is termed Darwinism may next receive attention.

Mr. Darwin's evolution has for its chief support natural selection and survival of the fittest. As to these supports it may be said that the majority of those professing to be evolutionists did not hesitate at the outset to accept, with scarcely any qualification, Mr. Darwin's views. But after a time there came a falling away and at present only belated evolutionists are found to be advocates of natural selection and survival of the fittest as propounded by that great naturalist. The evidence of this is abundant and within easy reach.

A professor of Cornell University, in a lecture before the Twentieth Century Club of Boston, after saying some foolish things, such as these: "evolution is accepted by all scientists and publicists," . . . "attacks upon it are made only by persons who are unfamiliar with either the evolution hypothesis or the facts of natural history, and who misunderstand or misinterpret what evolution really is, and who confuse evolution and Darwinism," made this additional announcement: "The Darwinian type of evolution has been abandoned by all scientific men." Which, by the way, is only partly true.

Professor Vernon L. Kellogg, in his decidedly candid book, *Darwinianism To-day* (1907), though a professed evolutionist, thus frankly sets forth the objections to evolution as held by the thinkers of the day:

"A constantly increasing number of working biologists find themselves on the basis of their accumulated individual observation, experience and thought, unsatisfied with the explanation and adaptation and species-forming, offered by the selection theory. Man using or rather testing these theories every day in the year by work in field and laboratory find selection insufficient to explain the conditions that observation and experiments reveal to them. These men are students in all the different departments of biological work; they are zoologists, botanists, palaeontologists; they are students of anatomy, physiology, physics, and taxonomy (classification); they are embryologists, pathologists, animal and plant breeders. From all these lines of work come the following increasing complaints:

'Selection cannot explain for me what I see to exist.' From some the cry is more bitter: 'Selection is a delusion and false guide. I reject it utterly.' The biological experimentalists, the students of variation and heredity, of life mechanics, of physico-chemical biologists, are finding that the rigid theory that selection controls all processes and phenomena, is a rock to which they will no longer be bound."

Professor Thomas Hunt Morgan, author of *Evolution and Adaption*, is of opinion that scientists while advocating evolution are at the same time more or less at sea. He says:

"I venture to prophesy that if any one will undertake to question modern zoologists and botanists concerning their relation to the Darwinian theory, he will find that, while professing in a general way to hold the theory, most biologists have many reservations and doubts which they keep to themselves, or at any rate do not allow to interfere either with the teaching of the Darwinian doctrine or with the applications which they make of it in their writings."

Professor Thomas Dwight expresses essentially the same thought in these words:

"If any one will ask any of this class (the class of college graduates), one I mean who follows lectures and reads books, even a medical student, whether or not he believes in evolution, he will promptly reply that he does. Then ask him why he believes in it, and the result will be surprising. You will find him quite at a loss for a definite answer and disposed to take refuge in some platitude such as 'the survival of the fittest.' He could hardly be more nonplussed if you were to question him on religion."

Dr. D. Dewar, an eminent zoologist of Great Britain, after having spent many years in the tropics studying animal life there, was led in *The Albany Review* (London), to take strong ground against selection and survival of the fittest. This is the summing up of his paper:

"Natural selection, while capable of producing new species from those already in existence, is not able to account for the other phenomena that have to be accounted for. The theory of the survival of the fittest is not sufficient. It has its limitations. Through lack of perception of these limitations the whole of the evolutionary science has within the past ten years been in process of transference to a false foundation."

Professor Huxley has this to say:

"After much consideration and with assuredly no bias against Mr. Darwin's views, it is my clear conviction that, as the evidence now stands, it is not proved that a group of animals having all the characteristics exhibited by species ever have been originated by selection, whether artificial or natural."

President J. G. Schurman of Cornell, in his book, *Ethical Import of Darwinism*, makes this affirmation: "Natural selection produces nothing; it only calls for what is already in existence. The survival of the fittest is an eliminative and not an origina-tive process." And then he adds, quoting from Hugo de Vries' book, entitled *Species and Varieties*: "Natural selection may explain the survival of the fittest but it does not explain the arrival of the fittest."

Korschinaky, a Russian botanist, in a paper found among the publications of the Academy of Science of St. Petersburg, vigorously assails both selection and struggle for existence:

"Darwinism and Weismann's modifications of the survival of the fittest have so much against them that they scarcely have merit enough to be called scientific."

Professor Fleischmann of Erlangen, a former evolutionist, but a recent convert to anti-Darwinism, in a book entitled *Die Darwinsche Theorie*, reaches this conclusion:

"The Darwinian theory of descent has in the realms of nature not a single fact to confirm it. It is not the result of scientific research but purely the product of the imagination."

M. Joachim Barrande, in his *Errors of Evolution*, after noticing the fact that no trilobites are found below Silurian rocks, though remains of plants and marine worms are preserved there, and that the trilobites appear at once in great abundance, thus comments on its bearing upon Darwinism:

"All these sudden manifestations of life under new typical forms, appearing constantly and everywhere with the plentitude of their distinctive characters, are in complete discord with the hypothesis of a gradual development by insensible and successive variations, since such a transformation can only be wrought out through an indefinite series of intermediate forms, of which no trace has been found in any country."

John S. Henslow, the botanist, in his *Origin of Floral Structures*, also antagonizes natural selection on the ground that the exceedingly complex correlation of floral structures can not be explained by the natural selection of chance variations, and Professor Delage, the French zoologist, in his attack on Darwinism, shows that species tend to stand still rather than to change.

Hans Driesch, the well known botanist of Heidelberg University, in his Gifford Lectures, at the University of Aberdeen for 1907, on "Science and Philosophy of Organisms," thus combats Mr. Darwin's theory, not only for the lack of facts, but for failure to explain conditions that underlie such alleged facts:

"Dogmatic Darwinism has been found unable to explain every kind of adaptation; for instance, those existing between plants and insects. It has been found to be quite inadequate to explain the first origin of all newly formed constituents of organisms. The special strength of Darwinism is said to lie in its explaining everything that is useful in and for organisms. But, in spite of that claim, Darwinism fails absolutely to explain those most intimate organic phenomena which may be most useful of all; and Darwinism in its dogmatic form is not able to explain the origin of any sort of organic restitution. The result of our discussion then must be this: Selection has proved a negative factor only. And fluctuating variation, as the only way in which new properties of the organisms might have arisen, has been proved to fail in the most marked manner, except perhaps for a few merely quantitative instances. Such a result betokens the complete collapse of dogmatic Darwinism as a general theory of descent; 'the most typical feature of all organisms remain as unexplained as ever.'"

One of the ablest opponents of the theory of selection is Professor Albert Wigand, the distinguished botanist of Marburg. His three volumes (1874-1877) on *Darwinism* are almost exhaustive of the entire subject as well as being in every way up to date.

Professors Pictet, Gratiolet, Heer, and Dr. Falconer, each reject the doctrine of transmutation of species with a wealth of statement that would be crushing to all save those whose theories are dearer to them than truth based upon established facts.

In a recent number of "Veweis Des

Glaubens," Professor Zoeckler, of the University of Greifswald, employs these words:

"The claim that the hypothesis of descent is secured scientifically must most decidedly be denied."

Professor Robert Eduard von Hartmann, an evolutionist, and the anti-Christian philosopher of Berlin, under the title *The Passing of Darwinism*, states his view thus:

"The theory of descent is safe, but Darwinism has been weighed and found wanting. Selection cannot in general achieve any positive results, but only negative effects. The origin of species by minimal changes is possible but has not been demonstrated. . . . In this first decade of the twentieth century it has become apparent that the days of Darwinism are numbered."

August Weismann, in his book entitled *Nature*, affirms that "Darwinism for scientific circles is at its last gasp."

And Gustave Wolff, also an evolutionist, suggests that the attitude of science towards Darwin should be as if he had never been.

While at first thought one would look to Germany for a defense of Mr. Darwin's views that have heretofore been the basis of evolution as an applied science, yet as a matter of fact one finds that the majority of university professors of Germany, after a little more than a half-century, confess that Mr. Darwin's theory of the origin of species by natural selection is not only unproved but is incapable of proof. There are botanists, zoologists, biologists, biological philosophers and palaeontologists who are arrayed against Darwinism, and there are several others not yet named whose attitude is essentially the same—such men as Professors Wigand, Haacke, von Velstein, Reinske, Goette, Steinmann, Elmer, Rudolf Wagner, von Kölliker the Swiss anatomist, and Anton Kerner the Austrian botanist.

This, however, should be said, that while some of these men oppose Mr. Darwin, they are still defenders of evolution. Professor Oscar Hertwig, the eminent German embryologist, is a representative. In a re-

cent address he made this statement: "If the Darwinian hypothesis were swept away evolution would still stand where it was." The correctness of this announcement is not, however, so very clear.

We take the liberty also of saying that scientists may push Darwin one side, but no theory of evolution of any kind is possible except it adopt the fundamental principles on which Darwinism rests, namely, selection and the inheritance of acquired characteristics in the struggle for existence. This also should be said, that while these distinguished scientists, most of them Germans, are agreed in their opposition to Darwin, many of them are scarcely less in disagreement among themselves as to other phases of evolution. The fact is that evolutionists are split up into about as many factions as are the theologians, and "new schools of evolutionists arise almost as rapidly as do new schools of Bible critics."

Materials substantiating the points we have been making are far from being exhausted, and perhaps there are materials much more convincing than these we have employed, but we really need search no further, for no students of these subjects can for a moment doubt that the leading geologists and biologists, the world over, have been and still are in disagreement among themselves as to almost every phase of the theory of evolution, whatever point of view is taken, theological, geological or biological. Any layman may now adopt any theory of evolution that hits his fancy and he will easily find somewhere scientific

opinion that will favor the view that may be his choice. Theories of evolution one after another already have become "antique curiosities in the pathway of science."

But if, on the other hand, all these men whose names have been mentioned had been in agreement as to evolution, then creationists, at such a show of hands, would of course be thrown into confusion. But as the case stands, evolutionists being first and last in disagreement with one another, the case is altogether different. Here are scientists holding professorships of zoology, botany, geology, pathology, palaeontology, and philosophy, in the universities of Germany, France, England, America, and in other countries, who on vital points are not able to come to an agreement among themselves. What we may therefore insist upon is this: If in the nature of things a reconciliation among these representative leaders of scientific thought and of the evolutionary theory seems less and less probable, as investigations and experiments are carried on, which actually seems to be the case, then the hypothesis of evolution should be discredited and remain in that plight until a reconciliation is at least in sight. For it is a rule, well established, that a theory, or a working hypothesis, (evolution is nothing more than this) in order to claim attention and support should receive the assent of all or nearly all who are capable of investigating it. And it is also a recognized law of evidence "that nothing is proved regarding which the chief witnesses are on opposite sides."

TO BE CONTINUED.

Professor Orr in *The Bible Under Trial* gives these facts:

"Let the reader take his stand for a moment in the last quarter of the second century" (an interval shorter than from the Revolution of our day): "Plenty of literature has come down to us from that period, and, in the clear light it casts on the conditions of the time, what do we find? The four Gospels—the four we have—and none else, in universal circulation and undisputed use throughout the Church, unanimously ascribed to the authors whose names they bear, circula-

ting not only in their original tongues, but in Latin, Syriac, and other translations, freely used, not only by Fathers of the Church, but by pagans and heretics, and by these also ascribed to the disciples of Christ as their authors. We find harmonies made of them, commentaries written on them, and catalogues of books drawn up, in which they stand at the head; and all this, with just as little doubt, or trace of dissent, as in the case of Robert Burns's Poems, Bunyan's Pilgrim's Progress and Charles Wesley's Hymns."

Not Always "In Union Is Strength."

REV. ALBERT H. PLUMB, D.D.

Author of "*When Mayflowers Blossom*."*

Though it is saddening that some who reject or ignore the evangelical faith have felt emboldened to advocate openly a union of all Congregationalists with Unitarians, the circumstance is in one way encouraging. It certainly clears the air. It reveals nothing new, but is simply an index of what already exists, yet has not been sufficiently recognized hitherto because of the long-continued method of secrecy, which has been a distinguishing mark of the liberal policy. There has been a striking analogy to the furtive measures of the Roman hierarchy, waiting with feline patience and watchfulness till the supposed arrival of the psychological moment for coming into the open. Yet here is where Rome has repeatedly blundered, and largely lost her hold in Europe, by revealing her defects to full view when aggression was considered safe; and, if we mistake not, here is where masked Liberalism has also erred in throwing off the mask "an hour too soon," as Napoleon commented at Waterloo a hundred years ago, when the fateful combat was joined.

We cannot understand why those of liberal persuasion should be invited to join a denomination classed among evangelicals. We should rejoice indeed, if after a century's vain endeavor to shatter orthodoxy, they had at last become convinced there is some power in this faith, that all its adherents are not the irrational victims of obsolete and semi-barbarous thinking—but alas! where is the evidence of any change of views, since the far day when they instituted persistent undermining manœuvres of which no conservative body has ever been guilty? The pursuance of such tactics, in quietly excoriating churches, seminaries and press organs, has been left to those whose creed emphasizes "salvation by character."

One would be tempted to smile were it not so tragic. However, there is a real sense of relief as they come from cover now, in some degree, and we are reminded of Milton's splendid challenge: "Though all the winds of doctrine were let loose upon the earth, so Truth be among them, we need not fear. Let her and falsehood grapple. Whoever knew her to be put to the worse, *in a free and open encounter?*" (Italics ours.)

Will some one advise us, why those who have not changed their avowed beliefs should be invited to come to us, rather than that those among us who have abandoned our still erect evangelical standards, should go and rally under the regular banners of negation? The God-man with unerring vision foretold that many would stumble because of him, and he was always patient with sincere seekers. If there is sufficient truth in the professedly liberal sect, if the abundant blessing of God attends its operations, let all who feel decided about its claims frankly enter its camp, where they will be sure of a welcome; and there they can put to the test whatever of worth it possesses. Then, if convinced of its relative impotency, and the fallacy of its assumed superior wisdom, they may return to their former fold where at first they felt quite out of place. So a once prominent evangelist happily did, and many a young pastor has returned, convinced of the need of a working Gospel.—We have been speaking only of those who have deliberately forsaken the evangelical faith, whose outgoing would mean no real change for them, in conviction. Though Mr. Mills' course in going away was a most perilous one, like all such, it was nevertheless much more honorable in him to do so, since his mind was thus set, than to have stayed as many do, in an environment utterly uncongenial to himself and others; and in that case, we venture to say, the baseness of hiding his changed theological uniform would have

**When Mayflowers Blossom*, a Romance of Plymouth's first years. New York: F. H. Revell Co. 506 pages. \$1.50 net.

kept him still to-day spiritually absent from the believing host, while nominally present.

Why, brethren, in the name of the God of truth and common sense tell us, why should one religious body be requested to join another whose beliefs the first does not accept? Would it not be more in keeping with this age of exact specialization and scientific application, that the liberal branch of yet professed Trinitarian Congregationalism should without further hesitation unite with the Unitarian order under the latter's name? For they are united already in everything but the name. Hence the confusion. We would deplore their departure, but it is virtually accomplished now; and the considerable number tarrying at the half-way station usually proceed after a while, along the road they entered. How noticeable this is! Though we are glad for many who do return, and hope their number will presently increase.

Who can afford to evade these momentous issues? Let no man call it insignificant quibbling, to defend as essential to our faith, the sublime truths of the person and primacy and atoning death of the Son of God, "who himself hath carried up to the tree our sins in his own body," a Prince omnipotent whom the grave could not hold. Disparage considerations like these as inconsequential? Shall their open or tacit disregard be no bar to full fellowship with such as reverence these truths? An aggressively liberal journal concedes that the person of Christ is to engage theological

thought again. Surely it must. Let it be with blessed result still. In portraying the history of our forefathers at Plymouth, I have faithfully labored, and I hope not in vain, to show the fundamental importance of these verities of God, and of Christ in God even the truth which guided and girded those Pilgrim heroes, and which alone is potent in all ages.

The Lord forbid that we should wound any brother who, sincerely as Thomas, "walketh in darkness and hath no light," though many who should discern better incur the divine indignation by putting "darkness for light and light for darkness." God is Judge. The honest seeker will be led, if we do not change his spirit, and thus his goal, by any ungentleness in a crucial hour. Remember this, friends. And we are confident the BIBLE CHAMPION, with its commendable zeal and greatly needed protests, would discourage none whose soul may be wrestling with difficulties against his will, free from unworthy motive. Also we are ever ready to agree where we may. Have you not felt the touch of even a certain fellowship, as you saw something beside formalism in the Moslem who, though in his darkness, lingered prostrate in adoration of the Almighty?—But was I to remain silent, during a voyage with a renegade English Moslem who had been doing "missionary" work in London streets and tried it on me? In instances where mighty basic truths are at stake, this is more of a parallel case than some would like to admit.

NAAMAH AND NIMROD.

Among the many books brought to the notice of the BIBLE CHAMPION, this one demands special attention. It is by a Layman, James B. Tannehill. It is strikingly original, unique and interesting. The author handles the question without gloves. Few books have been so outspoken, and merciless. He seems to have carefully studied the methods of the critics and does not scruple to reply in kind. As we are permitted to quote at length from the work, we will let the samples we select make their own appeal. The range of the discussion is surprisingly wide. The authorities given are numerous. The arguments

are largely and almost wholly statements of facts in disproof of theories. One form of reply, which is found many times, is to show the absurdity of the critical assault. It is very effective, in numerous instances startling, in others ridiculous and even comical. The author evidently enjoys his dissection of the critics and succeeds in making the process enjoyable to his readers. The critics find it but a fulfillment of the warning: "with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again" (Matt. vii. 2). The book is cloth bound, 358 pages, and will be sent postpaid for \$1.50.

International Sunday School Lessons for 1917

STUDIES IN THE BOOK OF CHRONICLES.

THE EDITOR.

(The References are to *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*.)

Sources Biblical and Extra Biblical.

The sources of the Books of Chronicles classify themselves as Biblical and extra-Biblical. Considerably more than half the contents come from the other Old Testament books, especially from Samuel and Kings. Twenty-five sources are named in addition to the Old Testament. Add to these many mentions of genealogical works, connected with particular times, those for example of David, Jotham, Jeroboam, and mentions of matters that imply record-keeping from Samuel and onward. Add also the fact that the Chronicler had a habit, exhibited in Ezra and Nehemiah, of using and quoting what he represents to be public documents, for example, letters to and from Cyrus and Artaxerxes and Darius and Artaxerxes Longimanus. (Ez. i. 1; vi. 3; iv. 7, 17; v. 6; vi. 6; vii. 11; Neh. ii. 7.) It is no exaggeration to say that the Chronicler claims to have had a considerable library at his command.

If such a library existed we should expect to find some mention of it somewhere. Such a mention is in the much-discussed passage in 2 Maccabees ii. 13-15. It occurs in what purports to be a letter written after 164 B. C. by the Maccabean leaders in Jerusalem to Aristobolus in Egypt. The letter has a good deal to say concerning Nehemiah, and among other things this: "And how he, founding a library, gathered together the books about the kings and prophets and the (books) of David and letters of kings about sacred gifts." It says that these writings have been scattered by reason of the war, but that Judas has now gathered them again, and that they may be at the service of Aristobolus and his friends.

This alleged letter contains statements that seem fabulous to most modern readers, though they may not have seemed so to

Judas and his compatriots. Leaving out of view, however, the intrinsic credibility of the witness, the fitting of the statement into certain other traditions and into the phenomena presented in Chronicles is a thing too remarkable to neglect. It purports to be an account of a library, not of a body of Scripture; and its list of contents does not appear to be that of either the Prophets or the Hagiographa or both. It is an exact list of the sources to which the author (or authors) of Chronicles and Ezra and Nehemiah claim to have access. The library attributed to Nehemiah corresponds to the one which the Chronicler claims to have used; and the two independent pieces of evidence confirm each the other.

Object in Writing Chronicles.

What judgment can we form as to the purposes for which the Chronicles were written? There are those who find the answer to this question a very simple one. They say that the interests of the writer were those of the temple priesthood, that it seemed to him that the older histories did not emphasize these interests as they ought, and that he therefore wrote a new history, putting into it the views and facts which he thought should be there. If this statement were modified so as not to impugn the good faith of the Chronicler, it would be nearly correct as a statement of his purpose. His purpose was to preserve what he regarded as historical materials that were in danger of being lost, materials concerning the temple-worship, but also concerning a large variety of other matters. He had the historian's instinct for laying hold of all sorts of details, and putting them into permanent form. His inspiration from God led him this way. He wanted to save for the future that which he regarded as historical fact. The contents of the book, determined in part by

his enthusiasm for the temple, were also determined in part by the nature of the materials that were providentially at his disposal. There seems also to have been present in his consciousness the idea of bringing to completion the body of sacred writings which had then been accumulating for centuries.

The text of Chronicles has been less carefully preserved than that of some other parts of the Old Testament. There is no proof, however, of important textual corruption. The fragmentary character of certain parts is probably in the main due to exactness in following fragmentary sources, and not to bad text; and the differences between Samuel or Kings and Chronicles, in transcribed passages, are mostly due to intended revision rather than to text variations.

Critical Estimates.—In critical discussions less semblance of fair play has been accorded to Chronicles than even to most of the other Scriptures. It is not usual to assume that the Chronicler's reference to sources is mere make-believe, that he "has cited sources simply to produce the impression that he is writing with authority." Others hurry to the generalization that the Books of Kings mentioned in Chronicles are all one work, which must therefore have been an extensive Midrash (commentary, exegetical and anecdotal) on the canonical Books of Kings; and that the references to prophetic writings are to sections in this Midrash; so that practically the Chronicler had only two sources, the canonical books and this midrashic history of Israel; and that "it is impossible to determine" whether he gathered any bits of information from any other sources.

Into the critical theories concerning Chronicles enters a hypothesis of an earlier Book of Kings that was more extensive than our present canonical books. And in recent publications are theories of an analysis of Chronicles into documents—for example, an earlier writing that made no distinction between priests and Levites, or an earlier writing which dealt freely with the canonical books; and the later writing of the Chronicler proper.

What we know in the matter is that three sets of authors combined in producing the Books of Chronicles—first, the men who produced the canonical sources; second, the men who produced the other sources; and third, the man or men who directly or indirectly put the contents of these sources together into the book which we have. We have no means of knowing what most of the intermediate processes were, and it is superlatively useless to guess. It is gratuitous to say that the mention of sources in Chronicles is not made in good faith. It is probable that among the sources were Midrashim that were nearly contemporaneous. It is exceedingly improbable that none of the sources mentioned were genuine and ancient. All probabilities agree to the effect that the returned exiles and their near descendants were likely to study the ancient history of their race, and to gather materials for that purpose. As we have seen, the phenomena of the book indicate the presence of an antiquarian motive which was sure to be interested in genuine items of evidence from the remote past.

Date and Authorship.—The current opinion sixty years ago was that the Books of Chronicles and the whole Old Testament were completed about 404 B. C., near the time when Artaxerxes Mnemon succeeded Darius Nothus. The statement now fashionable is that the Books of Chronicles were completed not later than about 250 B. C., and this constantly degenerates into the statement that they were written about 250 B. C. or later. In fact, they were completed within the lifetime of Nehemiah, not later or not much later than 400 B. C.

In discussing this we cannot ignore the fact that Chronicles and Ezra and Nehemiah are one work, or, if you prefer, one series. The closing verses of Second Chronicles duplicate the opening verses of Ezra. This is not, probably, an inadvertent repetition. The Books of Chronicles were written later than the other parts of the series. The closing verses are the Chronicler's notification to his readers that he has brought up the earlier history to the point at which he had previously begun the narrative in Ezra.

The testimony concerning Ezra and the "men of the Great Synagogue" and Nehemiah and their work on the Scriptures does not deserve the contempt with which some persons treat it. We know nothing concerning the Great Synagogue as an organization, but we know much concerning the succession of men, from Daniel to Simon the Just, who are called the men of the Great Synagogue. The old traditions do not say that Ezra was the founder of the succession, but they make him the typical person in it. Two bits of tradition are not necessarily inconsistent if one attributes work to Ezra which the other attributes to the men of the Great Synagogue. The regulation remark that tradition attributes Biblical work to Ezra and not to Nehemiah is untrue. Nehemiah was one of the men of the Great Synagogue, and prominent as such. He is introduced to us as a handsome boy, a king's favorite, coming to Jerusalem in 444 B. C. In 433 B. C. he returned to the king. After an unknown interval of time he came back to Judaea, and presumably spent the remainder of his long life there, dying some years or some decades after 400 B. C.

The placing of the work of the Chronicles at the close of the Hebrew Scriptures is in itself of the nature of testimony. The men who placed it there testify thereby to their belief that these are the latest writings of the Old Testament aggregate. Internal marks, also, justify the conclusion that the work of the Chronicler was complete before Nehemiah died. The abundant presence of Persian words and facts, with the absence of Greek words and facts, seems conclusive to the effect that the work was done before the conquests of Alexander rendered the Greek influence paramount. In some of the sections (e. g., Ezra vii. 28 ff; Nehemiah *passim*) Ezra and Nehemiah speak in the first person. The whole work makes the impression of being written up to date.

Truthfulness and Historicity. — "The Books of Chronicles are a tendency writing of little historical value"; "a distorted picture in the interest of the later institutions of postexilic Judaism"; "some ancient facts, having trickled down through oral or writ-

ten tradition, are doubtless preserved. . . . They are few indeed compared with the products of the imagination, and must be sifted like kernels of wheat from a mass of chaff." These statements, taken at random from the book that happens to be handiest, fairly represent the opinion held by many. They regard the Chronicles as a fabrication made in the interest of a religious party, a fabrication in which the history has been intentionally falsified.

A principal motive for this opinion is to discredit the testimony of Chronicles against certain critical theories, the said testimony being more full and detailed than that in Samuel and Kings and the prophets. But on the whole question the testimony of Chronicles is to the same effect with that of the other books. The testimony of the other books supports that of the Chronicles. The discrediting of Chronicles is part of a theory which denies the historical trustworthiness of practically all parts of the Old Testament and New Testament. If one is under bondage to the modern tradition which dates Deuteronomy from the time of Josiah and the priestly laws from after the exile, he must needs count these parts of Chronicles as falsified history; but if he is free from that bondage he will see no strong reason for counting them so.

In fine, men are correct when they say that the greatest values of the Books of Chronicles lie in their availability for vividly illustrating the great truths of religion. They are correct when they assign great value to these books as depicting the ideas of the time when they were written. But they are none the less of great value as repeating from the other Scriptures the outline of the history of the religion of Jehovah, and presenting additional material for the filling in of that outline.

V. I. p. 629-635.

Free Premium to every new subscriber to the BIBLE CHAMPION. "Constructive Studies in Matthew," by Dr. Daniel S. Gregory, formerly Secretary of the Bible League. 168 pages. Very valuable. Only one thousand left. One Dollar for the year and the Premium.

THE SUPREME COURT

Judge Francis J. Lamb had planned to guide the Editor in using the BIBLE CHAMPION to bring every contention of counterfeit criticism to the test of the rules of jurisprudence. A letter received after his death, was found among his papers and forwarded by his son to our office. He expressed regret that he was unable to keep his promise. He wrote enough articles for the BIBLE CHAMPION to suggest the method which he would have employed. This department will continue his work. Hon. Thomas Robinson, of Clyde, N. Y., will advise the Editor and write for the Magazine. We give extracts from an article from him in this number. The rest of the article we will use later.

The Bible is a series of writings which contain the words of God to man. This statement will not satisfy some persons identified with the Bible League. They insist that the Bible, and every word of it, is the very word of God. They say if we use the word "contains," it implies that it contains some things which are not the words of God. I frankly admit that they are right. That it does contain the uninspired words of men, and in one instance the words of a Power whom we call the Devil. In Genesis, chapter three, verses four and five, are his words. I firmly believe that the Holy Spirit saw to it that the historian reported his sayings correctly, but I do not believe that God inspired that Power when he uttered them.

I could quote many uninspired sayings found in the writings which we call the Bible. The persons expressed themselves in the manner of their race. I believe with all my heart that "men spake from God, being moved by the Holy Spirit" and that the Bible contains these sayings, but I am just as thoroughly convinced that some men spake who were not thus moved, and that the Bible contains also their sayings.

The foregoing naturally suggests the question, If the Bible contains the sayings of men who spake by Divine Inspiration and of those who did not thus speak, how are we to distinguish between them?

I answer from a lawyer's point of view. A man comes into my office and states to me certain facts or transactions which took place between him and another man, and asks me to advise him as to his legal rights. If the other party is a resident of this State, I examine the report of our Court of Appeals, our highest court, and see if that court has passed on such a state of facts. If it has, I tell him what the law is, and that from that decision there is no appeal. If the transaction was between him and a person not a resident of this State, so that the action would be in a United States court, I examine in like manner the reports of the United States Supreme court, and if that court has passed upon a similar case of fact, I tell him what the law is, and that there is no appeal from such decision. That the law is final. Every lawyer knows that there must be a Supreme Court whose decision is final.

The next question is, Does the Bible provide for us such a court? I unhesitatingly answer, It does. Jesus, the Christ, is such a court, and from His decision in any and all matters concerning religion there is no appeal.

Of Him John says, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." In Him was life. And the Word was made flesh and tabernacled among us. That He came from God and went to God. "And Jesus said of himself, 'For the Father judgeth no man but hath committed all judgment to the Son'; 'For I came down from heaven not to do my own will but the will of him that sent me'; 'That before Abraham was born I am'; 'That the words I speak are not mine but are those of Him that sent me'; 'That I had a glory with the Father before the world was.'"

He leaves us without the slightest doubt as to whom or what he claimed to be. And everything told us in the four Gospels corroborates His claims. The centuries have confirmed it. No sane man has yet discovered a word that Jesus ought not to have said. No one has suggested a better word He might have used.

He is the only person who never made a false step, never struck a jarring note. Every other person of whom we read, from Adam down to the present, said or did something that we wish he had not said or done. His language was unique and stands out alone by itself. Nothing like it before Him, and nothing like it since, except where writers have tried to imitate it. His was always life at its highest. He was the supreme artist in Life, and we feel He had a right to say, "I am the Life."

He dealt almost if not quite with religion.

1. The character of God.
2. The principles of spiritual life.
3. The forgiveness of sins.
4. The discipline of the soul.
5. The life to come.

These were His themes and on them He has said the last word, and these words are all to be found in the four Gospels. He made on all these themes the final deposit of truth, and no one since has added or can add anything to this deposit.

Upon these themes we have the Supreme Court whose decisions are final and from which we can give the law as to what in the Bible is, or was, inspired of God, and what is human, whether spoken by priest, prophet or apostle. Whenever one of them speaks of the character of God we say, Does he represent that character as Jesus did? If so, we say he was inspired. If he clearly does not, we say it is human and not inspired. The same rule applies to the remaining four themes.

Jesus then as the Supreme Court having passed upon all these questions, the next thing to be considered is, How shall we interpret His sayings so that we may reach a correct conclusion as to His decisions?

There is a rule of law older than His advent which is still in force in all courts of the civilized world. It is in substance this: "Every person in his public speech shall be taken and held to mean that which a person of ordinary intelligence listening to him would understand him to mean, *unless* he expressly states at the time that he uses the words in a different sense." A moment of thought will show any one the necessity of this rule to hold any person

responsible either civilly or criminally for his public sayings.

There is another rule of interpretation in law very much like the above. It is this:

1. Who was speaking.
2. To whom was he speaking.
3. What was he speaking about.
4. What was the occasion, or what called it out.

Apply these two rules to the sayings of Jesus, remembering that he was speaking in an Oriental language to Orientals, and decide for ourselves what those Orientals, under the above rules, understood Him to mean, and we will get a correct view of His decisions.

Greenleaf in his work on Evidence states the Law of Ancient Documents thus:—"Every document apparently ancient, coming from the *proper repository* or *custody* and bearing on its face no evident marks of forgery, the law presumes to be genuine, and devolves on the opposing party the burden of proving it to be otherwise." I have emphasized proper repository or custody for the reason that a party offering in evidence an ancient document must first show to the satisfaction of the court that it is not only ancient but also that it has been during all the time in the proper repository or custody. This proper repository, says Greenleaf, "is when it is found in the place where and under the care of the persons with whom such writings might naturally and reasonably be expected to be found; for it is this *custody* which gives authority to documents found within it."

A failure to show this excludes the writings entitled the Gospel of the Infancy, and the writing called The Book of Mormon. The same failure to show the proper repository or custody would exclude so far as I know all the documents which our skeptical friends tell us they have found and which they claim to be very ancient.

SUPPOSITION AND PROBABILITY.

These two words occur very frequently in the books of the "learned Higher Critics." It might be well for the readers of

those books to understand what our courts hold as to the use of these words in determining questions of law and equity. The word "supposition" is never allowed to be used in a case on trial unless the admitted or well established facts exclude *any* and *all other suppositions*. I could give many illustrations of this rule, but it is so well known I do not deem it necessary.

As to the words "probability" or "probable," neither of these words is allowed in our courts unless there is some legal evidence to support them. The lawyer using either of them must call the attention of the court to *some* evidence in the case to justify his use of them. If there is none he would be sharply called down for using them, or either of them. Where there is no evidence of a fact, there is no probability. The weight of the probability depends upon the weight of the evidence.

FALSE IN ONE FALSE IN ALL.

This rule, which is often called to the attention of juries by our courts, is stated about as follows:

"Gentlemen, if you are satisfied that any witness has wilfully testified falsely to any material fact in this issue, you will disregard the whole of his testimony. 'False in one, false in all,' is the rule of law."

BIBLE FOR LITERACY TEST.

PASSAGES WILL BE SELECTED IN MORE THAN HUNDRED LANGUAGES.

Washington.—Reading matter for a literacy test for aliens under the new immigration law will be taken from the Bible, the Department of Labor announced recently. Passages will be selected in more than 100 languages and dialects.

"This is not because the Bible is considered a sacred book by many people," said the Department's announcement, "but because it is now the only book in virtually every tongue. Translations of the Bible were made by eminent scholars, and, what is more to the point, the translating was done by men whose purpose it was to put the Bible in such simple and idiomatic expressions in the various foreign languages as would make it possible for the common

Apply this rule to the raising of Lazarus, which so many of the graduates of Union Theological Seminary of New York City, say in their examinations for license to preach, that they at least doubt.

It is now settled (to use the language of our courts) beyond a *reasonable* doubt that the Apostle John wrote the Gospel bearing that name. If so, he claimed to have been a witness present from the time that Jesus first heard of the sickness of Lazarus until he raised him from the dead and including the talk with Mary and Martha, and then continues to give an account of a supper given at the home of Mary and Martha at which this same Lazarus was present, after he had been raised from the dead. The whole account is either true or it is a deliberate falsehood "manufactured (as the saying is) out of whole cloth."

Apply the rule of law. The fact was certainly material. If he manufactured the story he is not worthy of belief in relating any of the sayings or doings of Jesus from the first talk with John the Baptist to the last at the sea of Tiberias. They must all go, and ought to. This rule is not an arbitrary one made by judges. It is absolutely necessary for the proper administration of justice in the world.

people of foreign countries to grasp the meaning readily and thoroughly.—*Associated Press Telegram*.

BE A PERPETUAL SUBSCRIBER.

"Do not discontinue, but let us come on perpetually to bless your home. When time comes to renew if you can not send the whole amount, send Fifty Cents to pay for six months. If you can send no money at all, write and say that you will pay later, stating the time, if possible, when it will be convenient for you to pay. We want you to have the magazine. That is what we print it for. We are willing to accommodate but we do not want to lose on lapsed subscriptions. Let all our people decide to be perpetual subscribers."

THE HOLY CITY

This Department will apply Biblical methods and Principles to the City Problem. The Downtown Church is no longer the specialties of the cities of the first class. It is becoming a condition of all cities, and compels a readjustment of methods to existing conditions, or as the only alternative, desertion of the field and sacrifice of the property. The Editor in his earliest ministry was thrust into special work which compelled careful examination of the whole City Problem as it affected Church work. In Manchester, N. H., by services in the opera house, with 1,700 chairs, he gathered and held for three years an audience that, Sunday evenings, always filled the house. The expiration of the time limit caused his removal. He was sent to Lewiston, Me., to a church in sore straits. The methods adopted to fill the opera house crowded the church and necessitated completing an unfinished gallery. At the end of three years he was transferred to a church in peril in Rhode Island, and the same methods saved and re-established the church. He was appointed to a great church in Providence, R. I., and continued the same methods of work. The results were such a phenomenal success that the church from his pastorate has held the rank of one of the leading societies in the denomination. Its new building is now in process of erection. The Sunday School Building and Great Audience Room will be unsurpassed in the land.

He was called to the Cornell Memorial Church, New York City, and after two years was invited to Simpson Church, Brooklyn, and later to DeKalb Avenue Church, Brooklyn. It is not necessary to make any remarks about these pastorates. The results are now history and speak for themselves. The last seven years were devoted to saving Trinity Church, Harlem, New York. The sale of the property and desertion of the field was lost by but one vote before he was appointed. The little band was held together; the endowment property was developed; and now three four-story buildings will insure the perpetu-

ity of the work for all time, if the work is properly cared for and the heroic band of workers are encouraged and supported in their struggle as would be done if they were in Rome instead of New York.

And now begins a new chapter in Brooklyn. We purpose in this Department to report progress, suggest methods, and discuss principles, that should make the City surpass the Country as a legitimate and fruitful field for every form of Church work. In this number a brief outline is given of the opening plans and brief comments and reports from the city press.

This church, like Trinity, New York, makes it possible for its pastor to serve the Bible League as a labor of love, without compensation; also, in its commodious parsonage, it houses superbly the office and work of the BIBLE CHAMPION without charge. We will solicit from the many friends to whom the magazine goes, the placing of this great City Forward Movement among the interests to which they may contribute, and help us solve the City Problem in this City of Churches.

FIRST METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH,

Williamsburg, Brooklyn, N. Y.

So. 2nd St., Between Driggs and Roebling,

111 YEARS YOUNG.

It is said, "A woman is as old as she looks; a man is as old as he feels." The years of a church are measured by what it does. The longer its experience, the more vigorous should be its spirit; the greater its influence and power.

The Editor was transferred from Trinity Methodist Episcopal Church, Harlem, New York, to First Methodist Episcopal Church, Williamsburg, Brooklyn, N. Y. Sunday, June 10, the church celebrated its 111th anniversary. The *Brooklyn Eagle* says, in this number:

"Organized in the year 1800, this body of Methodists has been the mother church of

nearly all the churches of its denomination in the present Eastern District."

Like hundreds of other churches in the cities, whose original territory has changed its populations, and whose rapid transit has been greatly improved, it appeals to the whole city, rather than to a restricted section, for a hearing and support. It can be reached by many surface lines, and two elevated roads, with a short ride for one fare. The church, whose legal title for nearly a century has contained the word *First*, is not necessitated to employ the word *Second* in its popular title.

The desire and design of all who are associated in the work is to restore this historic church to the leadership to which it is entitled, not only by its long service and great achievements, but by its legal name as given in the caption of this note.

The plan of campaign briefly outlined below will indicate the spirit, purpose and methods that will maintain and direct the Forward Movement now begun. There will be no effort to win Hebrews, Catholics, or communicants of other denominations. Protestants without a church home will be sought after by every means that experience, sagacity and enthusiasm can devise, to become associated with *the Homy Church*.

Boys and girls, as will appear below, are to have every facility and aid to arouse and develop interest and enthusiasm in Sunday School and Church Work. No place will be brighter, more attractive or fuller of life than *the Homy Church*. Music, pictures, games; a cheery, sympathetic and loving look-out, to give what youngsters like and want, will be busy, ever seeking new ways and means to please, entertain and instruct.

Young people, who love desirable, attractive and sympathetic companionship of other young folks, will find *the Homy Church* their ideal. Opportunity for the association of the two sexes, under the chaperonage of ladies and gentlemen who have not forgotten their own day-dream hours, will prove the church vestry and the adjoining rooms perfect places for social recreation, friendship and worship.

Womanhood will have a field of influence and service of its own special fitness, privilege and blessing. Men who want to vary the ordinary associations with opportunity to meet with men *only*, will esteem very highly the Men's Camp-fire, with a camping lunch of their own making and service. The masculine mind can have full play in working out the problems of church work.

An earnest, hearty and affectionate appeal is made to all classes, and conditions, who are destitute of church privileges, to accept the open hand of this 111 years young *Homy Church*.

The messages of the minister will deal with this world, while not forgetting that all are citizens of another world. Teacher, Preacher, Pastor, University President, Lecturer, Editor, Author, his experience has taught him that thinking men are to be won to follow their leader by safe, sane, and brotherly words and ways. The city will be in no doubt or uncertainty as to the attitude of the Pulpit on all living questions. No hearer will be shamed by comparisons anywhere or any time.

To those who are tempted to despise the small things of the present time as compared with the ancient glory, it is recommended to read a few words in Ezra and Haggai.

At the foundation laying of the temple, the people shouted with a great shout, because the foundation of the house of the Lord was laid.

"But many of the priests and Levites and chief of the fathers, who were ancient men, that had seen the first house, when the foundation of this house was laid before their eyes, wept with a loud voice; and many shouted for joy:

"So that the people could not discern the noise of the shout of joy from the noise of the weeping of the people." (Ezra iii. 12, 13.)

Haggai had little patience with that sort of noise and said pretty sharply:

"Who is left among you that saw the house in her first glory? and how do ye see it now? Is it not in your eyes in comparison of it as nothing?

"The glory of this latter house shall be

greater than of the former; and in this place will I give peace, saith the Lord of Hosts." (Haggai ii. 3, 9.)

THE HOLY CHURCH.

Our ideal is a *Holy Church*. We purpose to offer to the children and young people a spiritual home with all the comforts, privileges and associations of an ideal home. There are thousands of young people in Brooklyn who are earning a livelihood, handicapped by the lack of the helpfulness and safeguards of home-life. They are unable to form acquaintances, or associate with other young people, save at their work or in a public place, or on the street. We offer our commodious Church as a religious Home; but more than that as a place to meet other young people under friendly and sympathetic direction. They may bring their friends with them.

THE YOUNG PEOPLE'S HOUR.

Two week evenings each month, and every Sunday evening, will be the Hour of the Young People. The Epworth League will be the host, with a lady chaperone from the Women's League of the church. Every Sunday evening at 6 o'clock the vestry of the church will be open for a Social. At 6.30 p. m. a cup of tea and a roll will be the "love-feast" token; at 7 p. m. the Epworth League Service of Song and Worship will be held for forty minutes. The League will then adjourn to the audience room of the church for the evening service. They will occupy with their guests a section of reserved seats in proximity to the choir and with them aid in a brief service of song as the congregation assembles.

The pastor will be introduced to the guests at the close of the service. He will be their friend and helper in any and every way possible.

THE WEEK NIGHT SOCIAL.

Twice a month the Epworth League will hold a meeting a 8 p. m. After the brief business of the League, the evening will be spent socially in games, music, or literary exercises, recitations, readings, and discussions of the living questions of the hour.

To all of these meetings young people are invited as guests and will be encouraged to become active or associate members of the League.

BOYS' AND GIRLS' HOUR.

Every boy and girl in the Sunday School will be admitted into a Junior League. Twice a month, or oftener, if our plans succeed, the boys and girls will meet in the vestry for a social hour with games, a parlor bowling alley, and shooting gallery. The exercises will be varied. One feature will be training in singing by the chorister and organist. A junior vested choir will be added to the senior vested choir. They will occupy seats in the gallery near the organ. The processional of the two choirs marching from the vestment rooms to the church audience room, to their respective places, singing as they march, will be a very attractive feature of the public service.

THE WORK-SHOP.

The natural instinct of boys and girls to make things will be encouraged, developed and trained. The boys will be given manual training with tools—knives, saws and hammers. The manufacture of small articles will awaken the creative spirit and train in the skillful and practical use of tools.

The girls will be taught to cut and fit and make garments for themselves; they furnishing the material, and be allowed to keep and wear the garments.

THE BAKE-SHOP.

Two kinds of work fit into each other so naturally that all will be pleased and profited. Work and refreshments are no rivals, but partners. The *goodies* of life have become almost necessities. If we have made them, they taste all the better. It would not be surprising if:

"We eat in dreams, the goodies of the day," if we have had a successful batch. Candies, cakes, coffee, cocoa, tea, the necessities of picnic or camp life, will be a treat after we have learned how to make them. No boy or girl ever refused to join in this kind of work, if they shared in the sports.

OUR MEN'S LEAGUE.

All men of the church and congregation will be enrolled in the Men's League. We desire to mass in one organization all our men. It is not a source of strength, but rather of weakness, to the Christian Church, that the men are outnumbered by the women in the church membership. The Church will never win, until her male membership equals or excels in numbers the female membership. The taunt is often heard that Religion is specially adapted to women and womanly men, while the ministry is of neuter gender. A Man's Organization, by its masculinity, creates an atmosphere of power never felt in a mixed body. Male singing, when by a large multitude, possesses a charm and gives the hearer a thrill unlike any other form of music. We seek to bring our men together in a body that will meet at least monthly to eat a picnic or camping-out lunch prepared by themselves; all matters touching the Church and its work can be viewed from the masculine standpoint and discussed along the lines that impress and influence other men. Nothing will more quickly restore the old-time power and influence of this historic church than a concerted movement forward by an active and militant body of men of one mind, heart and purpose.

OUR WOMEN'S LEAGUE.

All women will be enrolled in a Women's League. The feminine element of the church, if no man is within a mile, will possess a freedom, an enthusiasm, a vision never possible to a mixed company. The great women's organizations for Missions and Temperance show what achievements are possible for organized womanhood working along lines suggested and directed by female instincts and intuitions. There are questions which men should never meddle with. They never do so without hindering or hurting. We seek through our organized womanhood to develop and foster our Sunday School and Young People's League. Boys and young men, who grow restive and rebellious and sometimes defiant under masculine restraint and authority, mellow and melt under the womanly smile

and soft word and respond at once to the mother appeal which every woman exerts unconsciously.

The four organizations complete the mobilization of all men, women, youth and children. With the motto, "All at it, and Always at it," effort cannot fail.

OUR SUNDAY SCHOOL.

Our ideal will be, not a school for children, but an up-to-date school for Bible Study by all ages. This is an age when infidelity has assumed the garb and mien and voice of an angel of light. The blatant unbelief and coarse blasphemy of Ingersoll and Paine have no more a place in the assault upon the integrity and authority of the Holy Scriptures. Wise and learned men of pure lives, professing deep love and boundless admiration for Divine truth, by indirection and suggestion, skillfully introduce distrust, beget disregard, and covertly teach denial of the fundamentals of supernatural religion. They seek chairs in evangelical schools to lead astray the thoughtless, and inexperienced youth entrusted to their care. They seek pulpits of evangelical churches, and by sophistry, rhetoric, and eloquence, teach in a most guarded form at first the views of the world's great scholars (?). As they make friends and strengthen their personal hold, they gradually lead their hearers insidiously and treacherously to a complete denial of the Divine Character of the Word of God.

All the time both classes of teachers occupy places and are maintained by funds sacred to the truth they endeavor to betray and overthrow. What makes this modern infidelity the more dangerous and dastardly, is the covert attempt to indoctrinate the children of the Sunday School with their false teaching.

111TH ANNIVERSARY OF SOUTH

SECOND ST. M. E. CHURCH

One of the Eastern District's old historic religious organizations is to celebrate its 111th anniversary tomorrow, and at the same time begin an active campaign to restore it to its former influence and power in the community. As the preacher

for this special event, the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Williamsburgh, now known as the South Second Street M. E. Church, has secured the Rev. Dr. M. B. Chapman, of Boston University, to deliver the morning sermon. The new pastor, the Rev. Jay Benson Hamilton, D.D., will deliver an illustrated sermon, entitled "A Quiet Hour With Jesus," at 7.45. There will be special music morning and evening by the choir, augmented with special selections on the grafonola.

The South Second Street Church has been passing through some trying experiences of late. Situated in the factory district of Williamsburgh and surrounded by apartment houses tenanted by peoples of foreign birth and of non-Christian religion very largely, its congregation has gradually melted away and left it, a monument to the past, amidst modern and unsympathizing surroundings. Until very recently, too, it has been under the compulsion of maintaining its existence on the same spot which has been its home for years. A few months ago, however, the restraining title to its property was removed, through the efforts of its former pastor, Dr. Alfred Hodgetts, and now the plot is clear of all restrictions.

Dr. Chapman, who is to preach there to-morrow, is a graduate of Mount Union College, Ohio, as well as of the School of Theology of Boston University. He was the pastor of the Harvard Street Church in Cambridge; Central Church, Lowell; New York Avenue, Brooklyn, and First Church, New Haven, before becoming one of the faculty of Boston University. The latter has recently released him to go on a lecture tour amongst the churches of the East. The people of the Eastern District congregation feel honored in having him with them.—*Brooklyn Daily Times*.

Free Premium to every new subscriber to the BIBLE CHAMPION. "Constructive Studies in Matthew," by Dr. Daniel S. Gregory, formerly Secretary of The Bible League. 168 pages. Very valuable. Only one thousand left. One Dollar for the year and the Premium.

CHURCH 111 YEARS OLD

TO CHANGE ITS NAME.

*South Second M. E. to Resume Old Title
First M. E. of Williamsburg.*

*NEW PASTOR HAS NEW IDEAS.

*Rev. Dr. Jay B. Hamilton Works to Regain
Former Prestige for Church.*

The one hundred and eleventh anniversary of the founding of the South Second M. E. Church was commemorated at all the services yesterday. For nearly one hundred years the church has been located on South Second street, between Driggs avenue and Roebing street.

Its legal title was "The First M. E. Church of Williamsburg." The Rev. Dr. Jay Benson Hamilton, who has been its pastor for only three weeks, has announced his intention of restoring the old name to the house of worship.

Because of changing conditions of the population in the neighborhood the church has lost some of its old-time prestige, but Dr. Hamilton, who for years had been pastor of Trinity M. E. Church in Harlem, brings to the Williamsburg Church wide experience, indefatigable vigor and somewhat new ideas in the conduct of churches. He is the first clergyman to use the stereopticon in distinctly church work.

Upon the second Sunday of each month he will deliver a series of sermons on "The Life of Christ," illustrated with slides.

Dr. M. B. Chapman of Boston University delivered the sermon at yesterday's morning service.

In the afternoon the Epworth League held service. For the young people the new pastor is installing a shooting gallery and bowling alley in the basement of the church. Dressmaking and cooking classes have been established for the girls.

A choir of twenty-six young persons has been organized within the last three weeks. Mrs. Milton Colborn is organist and Mr. Colborn is choirmaster.

At last night's service Dr. Hamilton delivered the first of his series of illustrated sermons upon the "Life of Christ."—*Brooklyn Daily Eagle*.

THE NAME OF AN OLD CHURCH.

(EDITORIAL.)

Nearly all old Williamsburgers will be inclined to regret, some will even be inclined to resent, the plan to drop the name of the "South Second Street Methodist Church" and go back to using the original one "the First M. E. Church of Williamsburg." The new pastor, the Rev. Jay B. Hamilton, favors the plan. He has been three weeks with the church, coming from Harlem.

In justice it ought to be said that legally "South Second Street" never had any standing. But those who for half a century have used a certain name for a loved church are impatient of technicalities. That is in the very nature of human beings.

Organized in the year 1800, this body of Methodists has been the mother church of nearly all the churches of its denomination in the present Eastern District. It has a history dear to Methodism. It has memories closely associated with the best life of its section. The first place of worship was on the Williamsburg and Jamaica turnpike. It was not until 1838 that the present site was used, four years before the church got its first assigned minister from the conference. Before that it had been part of the Williamsburg circuit. In 1875 a new wing was put on, and the building was modernized. Though locality has vastly changed, the loyal members and attendants have been sufficient in number through all the years to keep up energetic and spiritual activities.

On the whole, we would be rather glad to have the old popular name retained. It means more than a title containing the term "Williamsburgh." "South Second Street" is here. Williamsburgh has been a long time dead. That, we are sure, will be the feeling of many communicants.

—*Brooklyn Daily Eagle.*

WILLIAMSBURG, NEITHER DYING,
NOR DEAD.

One of the reasons given why the First Methodist Episcopal Church, Williamsburg,

Brooklyn, should change its title, which it has worn for over a century, is, that *Williamsburg is dead*. The Telephone Directory gives the names of over forty business organizations using Williamsburg as part of their title. The Williamsburg Bridge, and its Trolley Line, the Williamsburg Hospital, the Williamsburg Trust Company, and The Dime Savings Bank of Williamsburg, without the other forty, would be good enough company for anything, that was not "a dead one."

A business house that placards the city with signs that it has been over a century in business, certainly offers a Church a sane and safe example of enterprise, sagacity and common sense. This Church, old in years, but young in heart and spirit, is planning "to occupy until the Lord comes."

A centenarian, celebrating his hundredth anniversary, was asked if he expected to live another century. He replied: "Why not? I begin my second century stronger and wiser than I did my first."

This Church in the second decade of her second century announces a Forward Movement that will test her right to the name she bears. Friends of God who deplore the sacrifice of God's Houses, and the surrender of sacred places to business or paganism, are solicited to aid the work being planned. One thousand dollars are needed to carry on the work; one-third is in hand. Any who are in sympathy with the cause may send the Pastor One Dollar or more, and will receive a special receipt with the picture of the Church given in this number. Address the Pastor, Jay Benson Hamilton, 191 South Second St., Brooklyn, New York.

"Oh, no, we have to have the Bible yet. So long as people have to lean, so long as people have to have strength, so long as people have to die, we have to have the Bible. Oh, blessed Book! I lift my love note to thee. If any deny whatsoever, still thou art the language of God. And the wayfaring man though he were blind and dumb and deaf can hear thy voice, can see thy shining way, and have a lamp to light him into everlasting life!"—*Bishop Quayle.*

THE CLUB

I cannot refrain from telling you how well I like the *BIBLE CHAMPION*. Every number is better than its predecessor. The last number was unsurpassed. Professor Townsend's article on Evolution was brilliant and convincing. Its humor was delicious. If the theory of Evolution had any solidity in the department of speculative philosophy the doctor's dynamite would have blown it to atoms. In a few well-chosen sentences you disposed of the preposterous rationalistic explanations of the wilderness pillars; and then your story on "The Parson Rescued by the Bishop" was simply superb. How finely the *CHAMPION* is exposing the absurdities and peurlilities of these modern Pharisees and Sadducees who would rob us of our best treasure, and give us in return a Bible without the supernatural, a Christ without Deity, an utterly helpless Christ, and a universe without a Ruler, who blends the attributes symbolized by the rainbow and the throne. The *CHAMPION* is rendering an invaluable service in the defense and exposition of the Word of the Lord which abideth forever. It ought to have a nation-wide circulation. God bless you, doctor. Every blast of your trumpet puts joy into my soul and stiffening into my moral vertebrae. You are helping mightily to clear the theological atmosphere and to bring the ministry and church back to the faith which was once delivered unto the saints. May your bow abide in strength.

Cordially yours,

REV. WILLIAM MACNICOLL.

A wise man said: Keep thy friend under thy own life's key. We would like to lock our brother in our heart and *throw the key away*.

A GLANCE AT DARWINISM.

While it is well known that the evolution theory has broken down, some would-be leaders of thought still claim their origin from the apes. Were each claimant alone concerned, it would not be so important to

meet their statements. But there is still such a fact as "the investment of influence." Therefore, as in the financial world, it is necessary to distinguish sharply between what is sound and what is unsound. Two scientific laws—well known and incontrovertible—fully meet this part of the case.

1. The law governing the reproduction of species, "like produces like." The fir-tree never grows from an acorn, nor does the cherry-tree bear apples. Each produces its own kind. The same law holds in all forms of animal life. Sheep produce sheep—never cattle. Nor do cattle produce horses.

Says Huxley: "The one end to which in all living beings, the formative impulse—is tending, seems to be to mould the offspring into the likeness of the parent. It is the first great law of reproduction, that the offspring tends to resemble its parent or parents more closely than anything else."

2. Countless and varied as are the forms of physical life, science teaches that they all start from the same point; i. e., the matter from which all physical life—whether plant or animal—is formed, is in its first and lowest stage the same.

Huxley says: "Protoplasm is the formal basis of all life. . . . Beast and fowl, reptile and fish, mollusk, worm or polyp, are all composed of structural units of the same character, viz., masses of protoplasm with a nucleus."

Beale declares: "There is indeed a period in the development of every tissue and every living thing known to us, when there are actually no structural peculiarities whatever. . . . When it would not be possible to distinguish the growing, moving matter, which was to evolve the oak from that which was the germ of a vertebrate animal."

That is, making the closest analysis of physical life possible with the microscope, these scientists declare they cannot tell by the appearance of the little speck, which can be seen only with the microscope, whether from it shall grow a blade

of grass, a tree, an oyster, or a man. The great philosopher Newton, his dog, and the apple, which falling from a tree in the garden led to the discovery of gravitation, all came from something which in the beginning—so far as man can see and know—was exactly the same.

Now what made the difference in the development, the result? It could not be by chance, for ascending a few degrees we find the law of reproduction, "like produces like." From what we do know, we are led to believe that law reigns where we don't know, and therefore that it reigns at the very lowest beginnings of life.

How then account for the difference in development? One speck of protoplasm grows into an apple, another into a dog, and another into a man. Why? Plainly through the operation of natural law. The difference in results is produced by a difference in the co-ordinating forces. In one speck this force takes the resources of the speck, and whatever is added to it, and develops them into a plant—another into an animal—and another into a man. But it is a different force in each case.

It is always a *life principle*, but all life is not the same life, though One Mind is back of all. Life is the forming power, and so each organization grows in accordance with the life that is in it. If the principle of plant life is introduced into the speck of protoplasm, a plant is the result. If the principle of bird life is introduced, a bird is the result. If the principle of monkey life is introduced, *the result is a monkey—but never a man. The principle of human life is essential to a human product.*

In every case, the life principle introduced produces its own kind, and nothing else. Nor is the result any less the work of God because He works through natural law. The life principle is the hidden artist working out the plan given by the Great Designer and Creator of all. But when this artist is thus introduced into a speck of protoplasm, the development of that speck into a manifest form of life will be in accordance with that plan, and not by any possibility with any other. This is the law of conformity to type.

Thus two well-known scientific laws refute the claims of Evolution and prove the Darwinian theory of the origin of man impossible.

Carrying the thought further and reasoning by analogy, another important phase of truth is illustrated. At the same time the claim of a divine element in every man—which only needs development to assure divine favor and salvation—is refuted. In the physical world the life principle does not originally belong in the speck of protoplasm, but is introduced into it to work out the plan and produce the result. Similarly in the spiritual world. *Only when the principle of the Christ-life is introduced into a soul is the product a Christian and the result the salvation of that soul.*

REV. J. C. ALLEN, D.D.

THE GOSPEL THAT SAVES THE WORLD.

(From the Christmas Number of the *Seishono-Kenkyu* (Bible Studies).

Not the gospel of social reform; not the gospel of the Higher Criticism; not the gospel of arts and sciences; not the gospel of pure morality; but the old, simple gospel of Christ and His Cross,—that is the gospel that saves the world. And this gospel is still, as of yore, foolishness to the intellectual Greeks, and a stumbling-block to the papistical, Pharisaical, ethical, ecclesiastical Jews; but unto them that believe, the veritable power of God unto salvation. And when, as at present, the civilized world is steeped in blood, because of its vaunted civilization, shall we not with increased zeal, preach the old, simple gospel of Christ and His Cross, and so save the world through its (the gospel's) "foolishness"?

KANZO UCHIMURA.

Kashiwagi, Tokio, Japan.

LOVE.

The Term Love in Theology and Religious Literature. Its Correct Use as Seen in the Bible

I

We are told with much impressiveness that in these days the big word in Religion is "Love," which should dominate all religious thinking and Spirit.

II

If this be so then it is certainly very important that Sunday School teachers, ministers and theological professors, and all others use the word in the same sense that the Bible uses it, and avoid the bad errors growing out of its wrong use. Its wrong use in this case has been a *tap-root* of *Universalism* and *Unitarianism*. It is an old saying, "Words have their rights" as much as people, and should never be abused.

III

In the English language the word is so often the word needed that one can hardly open his mouth without using the word love or some of its forms. In common use it has two very different meanings, almost contradictory to each other.

1. One uses the word love when he wishes to express his pleasure, delight or satisfaction with some person or thing. Thus we say we love music or flowers or pictures. We love our parents, children and friends. We love our country, our church and our homes, and many more things too numerous to mention. By this we mean that they give us pleasure or gratify our feelings in some way. This is called the *love of Complacency*, from the Latin word *Placeo*, to please.

2. There is also another sense in which the word is also much used. There are some persons and some things so *bad*, so disagreeable, so repulsive that although we dislike them exceedingly, yet from a Christian principle, we think of them with *Good will* in spite of their badness. We may say that we love them but it is only good will, not pleasure. This kind of love is commonly spoken of as the love of *Benevolence*, from the Latin, *Bene Volo*, to wish well.

IV

The same distinctions exist, no doubt, in the Divine Being. God is Love (He is also Light and a Consuming Fire). When He is Love it may be sometimes Complacency, but oftener Benevolence. God loves His "Only Begotten Son and all holy beings, and sinless men with the love of complacency. With Jesus it is the same. Jesus loves His Father with filial

love, and all His disciples who have been born of God's Holy Spirit, and are sons of God, made so not by nature but by adoption," with the love of Complacency, and it is a wonderful love including all things.

V

But when it comes to Mankind, born in Sin, it is hard to see how a sin hating God, who cares for Purity of Heart, Truthfulness, Justice, Goodness, can have any other feeling toward the race than Good will, or Benevolence. The fact that Men are God's creatures does not make their standing before God any better. No man should be told that he is a son of God till he repents, quits his wrong life, lays his sins on Jesus Christ, gives his heart to God and is born of God by the Holy Spirit. Then God forgives his sins, gives him a new soul life, and loves him with some delight or complacency. The only love of God that should ever be preached to impenitent men is that of God's good will or Benevolence.

VI

These definitions also help us out in solving some of our problems arising out of our relations to our fellow men. God does not require us to have any other feeling than good will, Benevolence, toward His enemies and Christ's foes, though a sense of justice may prompt us to punish them, and not displease God. Christ has bid us "Love our enemies," an impossibility to most if he means pleasure, but much easier if we only understand him to cherish feelings of good will, as he certainly does.

VII

Every text in the Bible, where the word love is found if correctly explained will sustain this theology. The translators of the Bible knew how poor the word love with its double meanings was to give the real meaning of the original. They used such words as charity, goodness, mercy, and similar terms, to show that good will is the true sense. In the definition of God "goodness" (not love) is used to express His attribute of Benevolence, and if we do the same we shall do well.

REV. HENRY MARTYN DODD, D.D.

EDITOR'S WHAT NOT



THE TEARFUL CHURCH.

"A wonderful and horrible things is committed in the land;

"The prophets prophesy falsely and the priests bear rule by their means; and my people love to have it so: and what will ye do in the end thereof? (Jer. v. 30, 31.)

The artist has conceived a most beautiful and pathetic illustration of the Prophet's lamentation. We will ask him to draw one of "The Wrathful Church."

John saw the day when "the heaven departed as a scroll when it is rolled together; and every mountain and island were moved out of their places.

"And the kings of the earth, and the great men, and the rich men, and the chief captains, and the mighty men, and every bondman, and every free man hid themselves in the dens and in the rocks of the mountains;

"And said to the mountains and rocks, Fall on us, and hide us from the face of him that sitteth on the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb;

"For the great day of his wrath is come; and who shall be able to stand." (Rev. vi. 14-17.)

THE EDITOR'S VACATION.

The strain and stress of the double work has influenced the Editor to change his plans for the summer. *He will take a vacation.* The office will be closed. All communications will be forwarded to the summer address, and will receive prompt attention. Postpone all orders for books for the present.

Our friends are urged to get busy securing new subscribers, and urging the renewal of old subscriptions. Bible Conferences in important cities, beginning in the early fall are especially desired. The illustration of Philadelphia Presbyterian Fraternity on page 45 will help open the way if it is quoted.

We most earnestly appeal to all our friends to show appreciation of the historic Church that makes it possible for the Editor to serve the League and provide the offices, free of expense. Help the Editor win friends who will aid the Church in its great Forward Movement described in this number. Above all, will not every reader especially pray for both Church and Pastor, that the important work committed to their hands shall have Divine guidance and blessing.

UNCLE SAM.

He is a generous, patient, wise, and if need be, *stern* ruler. He called attention to our failure to comply with the postal regulations for the issue of second class matter. We followed the custom and method which we inherited from our predecessors. *But they were wrong.* We have straightened everything out in accordance with the rules of the Postal Department. We urge our readers to read carefully the first page in this number and promptly comply with its directions. Membership of the League, hitherto has been *first*; subscription to the BIBLE CHAMPION, *second*; to hold the privilege of second class matter all subscribers must observe the conditions established for all Periodicals admitted to the mails. Only a reasonable period can elapse after the expiration of the subscription before discontinuance. We urge every reader to examine the label. If it is wrong, let us know by first mail; if it is right, and the subscription is not up to date, send your dollar by first mail. Don't embarrass us with the Government by delay.

WATCHMAN, WHAT OF THE WAR!

We have taken counsel from many wise advisers and believe we have provided for all emergencies. As a bi-monthly, we are assured we can continue until the war is over. Our patrons have generously continued their support; our subscribers have for the most part brought their subscriptions within the limit of the postal regulations. We urge all to remain with us and aid in winning new subscribers. The conditions demand more than ever the utmost emphasis upon the infallible, inspired injunctions of the Holy Word of God. We dare not permit the enemies of God to belittle, defame, or deny the Bible.

If that is disregarded and discredited, we will have nowhere to go for Universal Guidance, in National and individual Duty.

The boasted wisdom of man was never more worthless than today. The nations who reject the Bible as a Guide-book in National Morals, Duties and Principles, will merit and certainly suffer the penalty of the nations of the past *who forgot God*. Prayer is the fundamental Preparation for Patriotism. The state papers of Washington, Lincoln, McKinley, in times of war, revealed their trust in God and reverence for His Word. We are tempted to trust in our riches, our unlimited resources, our inventions, our heroic courage, *and forget God*. Our rulers, nation, state, and city, should be men of piety; reverent and obedient servants of God, trusting in His watch-care, and imploring His guidance. The Bible should be in every soldier's knapsack. Every patriot who offers his life in defense of the flag, should be ready *to die well*. When that hour comes, as it will to many, *many thousands*, a promise of God, learned from His Holy Book, may be the only comfort and help, when all others have failed.

The man who dares to discredit and dishonor the Scriptures in this hour of infinite peril is the Nation's worst traitor, and the soldier's worst foe.

Stand by us and aid us in emphasizing with greater power and fullness and clearness the fundamental truth underlying National Hope, Honor, and Life—the Revealed, Infallible Word of Our God.

THE MISTAKE IN MATTHEW XXVII, 9.

In the May-June number reference was made to the error in Matthew which credits Jeremiah with a passage found in Zechariah (xi. 12-13), and various explanations were cited. The real explanation has not even been mentioned so far as I am aware. It is this. All quotations were made from memory in those days. No other method of procedure had been developed. Copying such things from a book was practically unknown. It was therefore extremely easy to confuse Zechariah with Jeremiah, which is what Matthew actually did. No other explanation is needed, and no other is really pertinent.

When God led the evangelists to write, he did not thereby deprive them of their human limitations or characteristics. What he did do was to enable them to write with sufficient accuracy to meet all human needs for the generations that were to follow. He did as much for other New Testament writers but no more. Hence we find in Hebrews (ii. 6) this curious statement, "But one hath somewhere testified, saying 'What is man, that thou art mindful of him?'" The passage is in the eighth Psalm and fairly familiar. Why, then, was such indefiniteness tolerated, if every single word in the Scriptures was inspired?

Every single word was not inspired. The Scriptures contain a human element as well as a divine one. Each is distinct and each is real. God was not concerned with the style or with the personal limitations of individual writers. He was concerned that they should tell the truth and that they should make

no error of any consequence; but he permitted each man to conform to the customs and methods of his times, when writing, and he permitted each one to be imperfect, since each was human. In this particular instance Matthew's Gospel preserves as a sort of linguistic fossil a slip of memory which testifies to the genuineness of the document and incidentally gives evidence that the Quelle theory is nonsense.

We have what Matthew himself wrote, not what some one else wrote in his name many years afterward. The mistake is evidence that the Gospel was not compiled from other documents, as the theory would have us believe, but was written off-hand by the evangelist and written from memory. That was the only method then in use, precisely as it has been until recently in China. The men of the Orient use their brains as notebooks and do not use a library as we do for the purpose of producing "parasitic literature." Modern scholars are notoriously wrong in assuming any such process for the beginning of our era. It was not even known, as imperfections like the one in question go to show. We may be duly grateful that they exist. H. W. MAGOUN.

"It is said that we cannot teach the ethics of the Old Testament in this age of education and culture. In the evolution of the race we have grown away from the barbarous ethics of primitive Hebrews; nor can we put into daily practice all of the ethical teachings of Jesus. Forever, the transcendent ethics of the master teacher must remain as beautiful ideals, fit, perhaps, for spirits who dwell in peaceful interstellar spaces.

'Where never creeps a cloud or moves a wind
Nor ever lowest roll of thunder moans,
Nor ever falls the least white star of snow;
Nor sound of human sorrow mounts to mar
Their sacred everlasting calm.'

but they are unfit and impracticable for men and women of flesh and blood in this strenuous age when the whole world is a network of railways, and the thunder of a million hurrying feet drown the heavenly voices, the finer melodies of the unseen. All this criticism, however, is but monumental ignorance, false culture, maudlin sentimentalism, or a startling revelation of moral blindness."—*Bishop R. J. Cooke, LL.D.*

PHILADELPHIA PRESBYTERIAN FRATERNITY.

The startling paper "When the Bible Was Blotted Out" was presented by Rev. Jay Benson Hamilton, D.D., at the meeting of the Presbyterian Ministerial Association of Philadelphia and Vicinity on Monday, June 11. The closest attention was given as the awful premise was stated, and the after-effects were depicted. The great comfort was constantly in mind as Dr. Ham-

ilton unfolded his plot that the premise could never be true. Probably the great place of "the Book" in world life was never more vividly realized.

A most hearty vote of thanks was tendered to the one who had delivered one of the most suggestive papers of the entire year, and especially good men are always on the program of this Ministerial Association.

Then the paper had an intensely human side. There was constantly hidden fun and invisible tears. Sorry, indeed, would be the plight if the once sacred page became only a ghost of white paper. The pathos of such a situation was felt in the invisible tears, as the calamity suggested by the speaker was even thought of. The effect of the paper is to make one regard a true and tried friend, "The Bible," with still greater affection.

REV. SAMUEL D. PRICE, D.D.,

Chairman, Executive Committee.

PUNCTUATION.

As is well known, the old manuscripts of both the Old and the New Testaments were written "solid," i. e. the lines without punctuation marks or even being broken up into separate words. Later, the lines were divided into words, and punctuation marks were inserted according as men's judgments thought the sense required.

The Revisers have many times changed the punctuation of the Authorized Version, and thereby altered the meaning; and so punctuation may thus transcend translation and become interpretation. In our family worship we use the Authorized Version, the Revision, and the Douay (Roman Catholic) Bible. The Romanist punctuation often differs not only from that of the Protestant versions, even when the division of the words into sentences is the same, but in instances it makes sentences differently. And as to flagrant translations— —!

A careful scrutiny of punctuation, if done with sanity and discretion, should not be inhibited.

Scores of times in the pulpit we have read John 12:27, "Now is my soul troubled; and what shall I say? Father, save me from this hour: but for this cause came I unto this hour." After the first hour the Authorized Version punctuates with a colon, and the Revision with a period. I always read it with an interrogation point. The idea is—"Father, shall I say, save me from this hour of suffering? Nay, because it is for this reason that I came unto this hour." Try it with the interrogation point, and see if it be not unquestionably best so.

The distinguished founder of the Clifton Springs Sanitarium, Dr. Henry Foster, through his long life conducted there on Sunday a Bible class which came to be one of the notable features of the institution. On one occasion there was present the then prominent Methodist divine, the Rev. Dr. F. G. Hibbard, whose Work on the Psalms has still great value to the Bible scholar. Psalm lvi. was under consideration. In verse four we have: "In God I have

put my trust; I will not fear what flesh can do unto me." Dr. Hibbard amended thus: "In God I have put my trust; I will not be afraid. What can flesh do unto me?" A great improvement, certainly.

Calling upon a nonagenarian, the Rev. Dr. S. S. Laws—a man who was president of a college, then president of a State university, then professor in a theological seminary—he gave me his change of Romans 8:34. The Authorized Version and the Revision both have it: "Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died," etc. That is to say, according to this form of expression Christ is the one that condemns! No, no; Christ stands between the believer and condemnation. So he punctuates differently, and answers one question by asking another. "Who is he that condemneth? Is it Christ who died?" And to the necessarily implied negative answer—often Scripture questions are of that sort, i. e. must be answered in the negative—he makes the rest of the verse confirmatory of it. Thus a difficulty is relieved and a beautiful and blessed truth is affirmed.

W. H. B.

WHY? WHY? WHY?

If we are mistaken in any one of the statements below, we desire to be corrected.

No school of any character, or any grade, founded, endowed and maintained to teach liberal theology, has, by hook or crook of any device, ever been stolen to teach orthodox theology. It has always been the other way. *WHY?*

No church, has ever been organized, a house of worship erected, funds gathered, services conducted for the propagation of a liberal religious faith that has been stolen and used for worship by laymen or ministers of the orthodox faith. It has always been the other way. *WHY?*

No orthodox minister has sought or been sought to become pastor of a liberal Church and insidiously and treacherously taught orthodox doctrine and stolen house and people from their denominational relation. It has always been the other way. *WHY?*

No Periodical or Publishing House of the liberal faith, established to issue literature in advocacy of the liberal theology, has been diverted to the publication of orthodox arguments to controvert liberal doctrines. It has always been the other way. *WHY?*

"I cannot tell how much we enjoy the BIBLE CHAMPION in our home. May God bless you in your effort to uphold the Word of Life."

"The man who took part in the prayer-meeting thought it was a fine meeting. I consider this number very good."—A contributor of one of the most striking articles.

"I have enjoyed reading it and hope you may be able to continue the publication."

See page 204, for particulars of the \$3.00 Club rate of
THE BIBLE CHAMPION with the
BIBLIOTHECA SACRA

OLDEST THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY IN AMERICA

EDITOR

G. FREDERICK WRIGHT

Bibliotheca Sacra was founded in 1844 in Andover, Massachusetts, where it was edited for forty years by Professor Edwards A. Park. Since 1883 Professor G. Frederick Wright has been its chief editor. Throughout all this time it has been the leading representative of broad Christian scholarship in America. Never in all its history has it had a wider or an abler set of contributors than it has at the present time. One of the leading scholars of England recently said that "in the discussion of Biblical problems there is no other periodical in America to be compared with it."

The writers Wiener, Dahse, Lias, Troelstra and others, whose articles in *Bibliotheca Sacra* have by general consent caused a halt in the prevalent destructive criticism of the Old Testament, will continue their contributions.

Among the conservative recruits for the defense of the New Testament is Rev. E. S. Buchanan, A.M., of Oxford, England, who has become the leading authority in the world on Old-Latin MSS., which give us the text of the New Testament two hundred years nearer the autographs than the oldest Greek MSS. These texts strongly support conservative views. See his epoch-making article in the October number. He will continue a regular contributor to *Bibliotheca Sacra*.

While representing the highest Biblical scholarship, *Bibliotheca Sacra* is by no means deficient in discussions of a popular character.

The October number will be furnished free to new subscribers for 1916.

Single Numbers, 75 cents

Yearly Subscriptions, \$3.00

THE BIBLE CHAMPION, 10 cents; Yearly Subscription \$1.00

Address,

BIBLE LEAGUE, 191 SOUTH SECOND ST. BROOKLYN, N. Y.

Bible League of North America

FORMERLY

THE AMERICAN BIBLE LEAGUE.

*An Organization formed to promote a true Knowledge of the
Bible and consequent Faith in its Divine Authority.*

Publishing The Bible Champion.

Publication Office: 191 South Second Street, Brooklyn, New York.

Officers

President

WILLIAM PHILLIPS HALL

General Secretary

JAY BENSON HAMILTON, D.D.

The Bible Champion

Editor

JAY BENSON HAMILTON, D.D.

WILLIAM H. BATES, D.D.

HERBERT W. MAGOUN, Ph.D.

**LUTHER T. TOWNSEND, D.D.,
LL.D.**

Associate Editors

**DAVID JAMES BURRELL, D.D.,
LL.D.**

**G. FREDERICK WRIGHT, D.D.,
LL.D.**

EXPIRATION—The time when each subscription to **THE BIBLE CHAMPION** expires will be found on the wrapper.

CHANGE OF ADDRESS—When a change of address is ordered, both the new and the old address must be given. The notice should be sent two weeks before the change is to take effect.

PRICE—Published Bi-monthly at One Dollar a Year, in advance, sent postpaid to any part of the United States. Subscribers in Foreign Countries are requested to add 15 cents for postage. Twenty cents a single copy.

REMITTANCE should be made payable to the Bible League of North America, and sent to 191 South Second Street, Brooklyn, New York.

ENTERED as second-class matter May 31, 1917, at the Post Office at Brooklyn, New York, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

(Volume xxiii--16)

20TH CENTURY MIRACLES

Happenings in a Western Sodom

JAY BENSON HAMILTON, D.D.

The best way to prove the possibility of Miracles is to work them. The Greatest Miracle-Worker told His followers: "He that believeth on Me, the works that I do shall he do also; and greater works than these shall he do." (John xiv. 12).

These Wonders were wrought by a Man, a Woman, and The Book. Each Adventure is complete in itself. All are a part of the one thrilling tragedy. The Story is a peep behind the curtains that conceal the heroic endurance and endeavor of the vast multitude of whom the world is not worthy. You will laugh, and cry, and shout, if your blood is red and your heart is not ice.

The Editor in his Campaign in behalf of Veteran Methodist Ministers heard tales as marvelous as Aladdin's, as incredible as Munchausen's, and as truthful as the Nazarene's. He was invited to visit a Conference held in a town, in which the first Sermon was preached in a Saloon, as described in the first Story; it began with a hymn and ended with a murder. During the Conference Session, he met many citizens who were worshippers of the first Parson and his wife. The Miracle Stories were told by the Pioneers who were leading actors in the incidents which they related.

LIST OF ADVENTURES

1. *The Sermon in a Saloon.*
2. *The Parson, the Champion Heavy-weight.*
3. *Judge Lynch.*
4. *The Water Snake's Bite.*
5. *The Parson's Wife, the Chief of Police.*
6. *The Parson's Baby, the Only One in Town.*
7. *Margaret Magdalena.*
8. *Mad Dennis and the Madonna.*
9. *Hiding the Parson's Kid.*
10. *The Lost Parson Rescued by the Bishop.*

These Miracles will be issued at once in book form, paper bound, and sent postpaid for Fifty Cents. We hope to sell the whole edition of 1,000 to begin the establishment of a Reserve Fund for the issue of the BIBLE CHAMPION. Nothing that has appeared in the Magazine in these four years has awakened the wide attention or received the flattering commendation of these Miracle Stories. Will our readers coöperate in pushing this issue before Christmas, that we may be able to plan for a Winter Campaign of Bible Conferences? Address the Editor, telling him how many copies you will take.

Professor L. T. Townsend's Books

Credo, Arena and Throne, God-man, Sword and Garment, Supernatural Factor in Revivals, Bible Theology and Modern Thought. The publisher's price for each of these books is \$1.50. Arrangements are now made by which they can be secured at 75 cents, postage prepaid.

The following Lectures can be obtained at 10 cents each. One of the Number has reached a sale of 15,000 copies.

Doctrine of the Trinity (48 pages); New Theologies, Only Bubbles (64 pages); Collapse of Evolution (54 pages); End of the World, Biblical and Scientific Points of View (62 pages); Bible Inspiration, (108 pages).

The following Sermons at 8 cents each:

Final Judgment; The Disreputable Woman and her Conversion; Temptation; Righteous without Knowing It; God and the Nation; Penalty of Unrighteousness; More Unrighteousness; Paul's Cloak, or Consecration; Esther, or the Wise Venture; John the Baptist, or the Ministry, Christ Approves.

These Books have been reduced to the price given:

Satan and Demons, 35 cts.; God's Goodness and Severity, 35 cts.; Adam and Eve, History or Myth, 35 cts.; Deluge, History or Myth, 45 cts.

Bible Studies, Part 1, Rules of Interpretation; Part 2, Current Difficulties Found in the Bible (89 pages), 15 cts.

New, God and War, 25 cts.; The Stars are not Inhabited, \$1.00; Hell is no Myth, \$1.00. Order only from the above list.

NAAMAH AND NIMROD.

By James B. Tannehill.

AN UP-TO-DATE BOOK.

A DEFENCE OF THE FAITH OF OUR FATHERS!

A Reply to

HIGHER CRITICISM AND NEW THEOLOGY.

It attacks and refutes these defamers of God's Word from every conceivable angle. It is the most original in its methods of all recent books.

Its chapters, on the Samaritan Pentateuch, Origin of Races and Languages following Noah's Flood, Babylonian Cuneiform Discoveries, Ancient Egypt, Ancient Babylonia, Geology, Anthropology, Prehistoric Man, Location of the Garden of Eden, Science and the Bible, Evolution, Discordant Profane History, together with the ingenious Hypothesis concerning Naamah and Nimrod, are each alone worth the price of the book.

Cloth Bound, 368 pages. .Postpaid, \$1.50.

Address,

BIBLE LEAGUE, 191 SOUTH SECOND ST. BROOKLYN, N. Y.

THE STORY OF MY LIFE AND WORK

BY

G. FREDERICK WRIGHT, D.D., LL.D., F.G.S.A.

CONTENTS

Happy Days of Childhood — College Days, The Antislavery Conflict, The Civil War — Ten Years in a Country Parish — Ten Years' Pastorate in Andover, Enlarging Sphere of Labor, Glacial Investigations — Beginning of Literary Work, Publication of "The Logic of Christian Evidences" — Call to Professorship of New Testament Literature at Oberlin, Continuance of Glacial Investigations — Significance of the Glacial Epoch, Explorations in Alaska and the Snake River Valley, First Course of Lowell Institute Lectures, "The Ice Age in North America" — First Visit to Europe, Second Course of Lowell Institute Lectures, "Origin and Antiquity of Man" — Shipwrecked in Greenland — Theological Studies, The Oberlin Theology — Third Course of Lowell Institute Lectures, "Scientific Aspects of Christian Evidences" — Through Japan, China, Siberia, Central Asia, Palestine, Egypt, and Italy — Results of the Asiatic Trip, Publication of "Asiatic Russia," Evidences of the Flood, Stone Lectures on "Scientific Confirmations of Old Testament History" — Third Visit to Europe, Observations in Southern Sweden, in Southern Russia, the Crimea, the Cedars of Lebanon, New Glacial Problems — Progress of Thought in the Twentieth Century — Things Which I Believe, Which I Fear, of Which I Am Confident — Appendix, Partial List of Articles in Periodical Literature, Index.

About 500 pages, 12mo. \$2.00, *net*.

Special Price to Subscribers of the Bible Champion.

All new Subscribers, all who renew, or advance their subscription one year, sending \$1.00, will be given Dr. Wright's book for \$1.35.

Address,

BIBLE LEAGUE, 191 SOUTH SECOND ST. BROOKLYN, N. Y.

OUR HERALD DEPARTMENT.

INTERNATIONAL STANDARD BIBLE ENCYCLOPEDIA

PROF. JAMES ORR, D.D., United Free Church College, Glasgow, Scotland,
General and Consulting Editor.

REV. EDGAR Y. MULLINS, D.D., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary,
Louisville, Kentucky, and

REV. BISHOP JOHN L. NUELSEN, D.D., Resident Bishop in Europe, of the
Methodist Episcopal Church, Zurich, Switzerland,
Assistant Editors.

REV. MORRIS O. EVANS, D.D., Cincinnati, Ohio,
Managing Editor.

The General and Managing Editors prepared the necessary lists of subjects and their grouping and classification; then, in conjunction with the Assistant Editors assigned these to suitable contributors.

Nearly two hundred contributors, many of them scholars of the highest rank, have been employed upon this work during the past six years. Over one hundred of these contributors are residents of the United States, about sixty of Great Britain and Continental Europe, and the rest, of Canada, Syria, India, Australia, and other countries. Anglicans, Baptists, Congregationalists, Lutherans, Methodists, Presbyterians, with those of still other communions, diverse in name, but united in the faith of the one Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ and laboring in the interests of His Kingdom, have all willingly lent their aid in the production of this truly ecumenical work. Valued assistance also has been unstintingly rendered by a number of Jewish authors. A large proportion of the writers are scholars engaged in professional work in leading Universities, Seminaries and Colleges—a fact which greatly enhances the responsible and representative character of their contributions.

Five Volumes. Royal 8vo. pp. 3541.

THE HOWARD-SEVERANCE CO., 1915

\$30.00

Address,

BIBLE LEAGUE, 191 SOUTH SECOND ST. BROOKLYN, N. Y.



CONTENTS

	PAGE
FROM THE PULPIT TO THE POOR-HOUSE.....	247
THE ARENA	
The Crusade for Kultur, <i>The Editor</i>	252
Scientific Opinion Opposed to Evolution, <i>Prof. L. T. Townsend, LL.D.</i>	259
INTERNATIONAL SUNDAY SCHOOL LESSONS FOR 1917	
Studies in Isaiah and Daniel, <i>The Editor</i>	266
Unity of Isaiah, <i>Prof. G. Frederick Wright, LL.D.</i>	268
THE SUPREME COURT	
Bible Miracles, <i>Hon. Thomas Robinson</i>	269
THE CLUB	
Is God the Father of All? <i>Rev. Henry Martyn Dodd</i> ; Testimony— a Plea, The Sin Against the Holy Ghost; An Up-to-Date Dic- tionary	271
THE HOLY CITY	
Play the Game; Blind Leaders of the Blind; Is Welching a Politi- cal Virtue?	274
EDITOR'S WHAT NOT	
The Liars in Daniel's Den; Saving Faith; "As the Fool Dieth"; Is Anything Amiss; Uncle Sam Smiles; Our New Home; Back to the Simple Life; President Wilson's Letter	283
OUR HERALD DEPARTMENT	243